

THE REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 3.—JULY, 1887.

I.

THE CIVILIZATION OF ANCIENT ROME COMPARED WITH THAT OF THE PRESENT AGE, ON THE PLANE OF MORALITY.*

BY PROF. GEORGE F. MULL.

THE term civilization involves a good many different elements, chief among which may be mentioned, the religious, intellectual, industrial, political and moral. Among these, we may safely say that, for the purposes of history in the advancement of the human race to its ultimate end and completion, none is of more vital importance than the element of morality. And yet, strange to say, historians have never considered it any part of their duty to concern themselves with the consideration of those great ethical phenomena, which come to pass, not on the world's great battle-fields, not in the strife of nations, not in the brilliant achievements that startle the gaping crowd into admiration, not in the ambitions and heroisms of the signally great of

* I am indebted to Lecky's "History of Morality," for many of the facts and much of the inspiration of this essay; and to some extent, also, to Milman's "History of Christianity," and Leighton's "History of Rome."

G. F. M.

all ages,—but in the daily lives of the people, in their thoughts and actions, in their manners and customs, in their family, social and business relations.

Beneath the current of human history, whose surface stands boldly forth as reflected upon many a noble and ignoble page of written lore, there runs a stream from remotest time, carrying in its bosom elements, which, in their bearing upon the real movement of our every-day life, are far more profoundly significant than the political, constitutional and military operations of states and nations. "In general," as has been well remarked, "the under-current of human life flows steadily on, unruffled by the storms which agitate the surface. The happiness of the many commonly depends on causes independent of victories and defeats, of revolutions or restorations,—causes which can be regulated by no laws, and which are recorded in no archives." It is no easy task, therefore, to arrive at correct and perfectly satisfactory conclusions in reference to the moral status of the general public in an age so far removed from the present as that period of the world's history, in which the Christian era had its beginning. I would ask the reader's indulgence, then, in this attempt to draw, in a somewhat general way, a comparison between the public morals of pagan Rome on the one hand, and of the Christian age of to-day on the other.

In preferring the Roman phase of ancient civilization, I am not unmindful of the claims of Greece to pre-eminent distinction in several very important aspects. We freely accord to Greece all that has ever been claimed for her in the domain of language, art, philosophy, literature,—those wondrous productions that have never yet lost their freshness and vigor, and which, we may well believe, will continue as a perennial fountain of refreshing, charming and elevating the mind with the beauties and graces of refinement and culture, and ministering to the amenities of life rather than to the needs and wants that are to be supplied from the stalls of the market and the shop. But, whilst we bow with becoming humility before these colossal

monuments reared in eternal attestation of the glory of the Hellenic spirit, we cannot close our eyes to the fact—made doubly painful by the sharp contrast presented,—that this same spirit was totally inadequate to prevent the people from lapsing into as subtle and spiritually destructive, though not so gross, a species of immorality, as the world has ever seen. It is true, we may have to come to the same ultimate conclusion in reference to the Roman society, but not before we shall have seen that the Roman character was made of sterner stuff than the Greek, that the will, as the organ through which the good is brought to pass, occupies a higher place in the economy of life, and that the conceptions of right and duty were something more than mere ideals challenging the æsthetic sense.

As a matter of general importance bearing upon the movement of civilization, it must not be forgotten that the world-historical spirit, which seems to be only the philosophical term for the Providence of God, failed to find an abiding place for its own more complete unfolding, until, enshrining itself in the *Senatus Populusque Romanus*, it burst the barriers of tribal, national and race distinctions, and sprang full-panoplied into a world-conquering power. For it is in the Roman world that the idea of cosmopolitanism first obtains realization, and the narrowness of Grecian thought and life embodied in the famous sentence of Aristotle, that "Greeks had no more duties to barbarians or not-Greeks than to wild beasts," was forever outstripped and supplanted by broader and more liberal views. It is not unreasonable to suppose that personal and national characteristics of fitness determined the selection of the Romans as the vehicle through which the world was to be prepared, on the secular side, for the incoming of that era in which it was possible to proclaim the universal brotherhood of man. Certain it is, that the bringing of the nations of the world under one government was the greatest forward step that had yet been made in the direction of solving the problem of human destiny.

The Romans, to be sure, were in a very important sense af-

fectured by contact with the Greeks, and, along with much that was degrading, they could not help but assimilate much that was inspiring and elevating. Thus their native characteristics became somewhat modified, but in no such way as to be un-Roman. They had, indeed, a keen appreciation of the excellence of the Grecian civilization and gave free scope to its influence,—which in itself is no mean evidence of their intellectual capacity and liberal-mindedness. Still, they remained Romans in spite of Grecian influence, and even a modern mind cannot be unimpressed by the magnitude of the problem which they successfully solved, and by the wonderful moral force they developed in the stupendous enterprises that have fixed the name of Rome in history as no other pagan name is fixed.

In the words of an eminent historian: "The Romans conquered like savages, but ruled like philosophic statesmen; till, from the Euphrates to the Atlantic, from the shores of Britain and the borders of the German forests to the sands of the African desert, the whole western world was consolidated into one great commonwealth, united by the bonds of law and government, by facilities of communication and commerce, and by the general dissemination of the Greek and Latin languages. Civilization followed in the train of Roman conquest. * * * * Diverging from Rome as a centre, magnificent and commodious roads connected the most remote countries; the free navigation of the Mediterranean united the most flourishing cities of the empire; the military colonies had disseminated the language and manners of the South in the most distant regions; the wealth and population of the African and Asiatic provinces had steadily increased; while, amid the forests of Gaul, the morasses of Britain, the Sierras of Spain, flourishing cities arose; and the arts, the luxuries, the order and regularity of cultivated life were introduced into regions which, a short time before, had afforded a scanty and precarious subsistence to tribes scarcely acquainted with agriculture. The frontiers of civilization seemed gradually to advance, and to drive back the still receding barbarism; while, within the pale, national dis-

tinctions were dying away; all tribes and races met amicably in the general relation of Roman subjects or citizens; and mankind seemed settling down into one great federal society." Thus it happens, that the reign of Augustus Cæsar is the most remarkable epoch in the history of mankind, and it is to that epoch and the era which it introduces, we must look for the highest blossom and fruit of the ancient civilizations. It was "within the walls of the imperial city, that the three great civilizations—the Latin, the Greek and the Oriental—found their centre, while from it, emanated influences before which, as Roman culture gradually spread, the laws, customs and languages of the provinces yielded more and more."

It is not unimportant to know, that, in the time of Augustus, the population of the city was about one and a quarter to one and a half millions, while the population of the empire, in the time of Claudius (41 to 54 A.D.), has been estimated at one hundred and twenty millions,* nearly half of that of modern Europe, a degree of population, which, Gibbon was able to say, forms the most numerous society that has ever been united under the same system of government.

Let these general remarks, inadequate though they be, suffice to refresh our minds as to the vastness of the Roman Empire, as to the heterogeneous elements entering into the civilization which flourished in the most brilliant period of Rome's brilliant history, and finally as to the difficulty that must be encountered in giving to the prevailing circumstances and conditions their true value in making up our judgment upon the question before us—the morality of the people.

Morality is a relative term,—that is, it must be measured by the prevailing notions in reference to what constitutes right and duty. Thus, it would be eminently unfair to apply the commonly accepted standards of morality as prevalent to-day,

* Of these 20,000,000 were citizens, 40 millions, provincials, and 60 millions, slaves. The population of Rome before the plague in A.D. 167, was about two millions. Hirschfeldt estimates it in the time of Severus—193 to 211 A.D.—at only 125,000.

to the practices of a people, who lived and moved in the various walks of life over eighteen hundred years ago. What we, in our age, would regard as highly immoral, might, in another age and under different circumstances, come to pass without being made justly liable to the same denunciation it would receive in an age of superior ethical culture. Instead, therefore, of employing the terms, morality and immorality, it would appear to be more just, as well as more accurate, to speak of morality as occurring in different degrees of purity, according as mankind approximate the ideal of absolute perfection in different stages of civilization. We might, for instance, go back to the heroic period of Rome, and in the earlier days of the Republic, where we would have no difficulty in discovering a phase of morality remarkable for its purity, and a condition of society, which in this respect might put our own age to the blush. But by so doing, we would descend to a lower level in the scale of morality,—a morality made conspicuous mainly by the absence of vices which were never dreamt of, and for the existence of which a rude and simple mode of life offers no room. Whilst such a manifestation of morality has peculiar fascination for a mind that morbidly contemplates the vices of to-day, it is still of a very low order and largely deficient in the quality of virtue, which must after all determine the measure of its excellence. It is much the same kind of morality as would have to be predicted of a man, who, by shunning the ordinary walks of life, escapes the temptations to wrong-doing which throng in upon him who bravely bears his share of the heat and burden of the day in life's furious battle. There is no fact in history more forcibly impressed upon our minds, than that the highest form of civilization always reveals the lowest depths of depravity; and the reason for this might, I think, be easily shown upon philosophical grounds, for, the same powers which, through human agency, are developed to a high state of fecundity in the interest of the good, may, and do, become, when wrongly directed, equally prolific in the sphere of evil. The perfection of the good challenges and elicits the perfection of the evil. But it is

not necessary for our purpose to prove this, and we need only say that examples drawn from the earlier period of Roman history would in no wise serve as evidence in reaching a decision as to the state of society in the later days of the Republic and the first few hundred years of the empire, when Roman civilization reached its acme.

In this part of our discussion we are happily saved the necessity of showing the ultimate connection of morality with religion, for the religion of Rome had already spent its force, and in the reign of Augustus had ceased to exert any perceptible influence upon the morals of the people. And yet, we ought not, perhaps, to neglect the opportunity of saying, that there was in the religion of Rome a much stronger moral element than in that of Greece. It is true, the Roman religion was political and military, but it could not well have been otherwise, since this was also the predominant characteristic of their whole national life; and when we reflect, that as the government was modeled on that of the family, so the state religion found its counterpart in that of the household, consisting, in fact, mainly in the deification of their own virtues, and especially of the domestic virtues, we cannot avoid attaching considerable importance to the influence of religion in the formation of the peculiarly earnest and practical cast of mind that distinguishes the Romans. "Temples arose to Concord, to Faith, to Constancy, to Modesty, to Hope. The Penates became the guardians of domestic happiness. Venus Verticordia presided over the purity of domestic morals, and Jupiter Stator over courage. Even Peace was at length received among the gods of Rome. And, as long as the worship of the heart continued to sanctify these impersonations of human virtue, their adoration tended to maintain a lofty moral tone, but so soon as that was withdrawn, or languished into apathy, the deities became cold abstractions. Their temples stood, their rites were, perhaps, solemnized; but they had ceased to command, and no longer received the active veneration of the people. 'It is marvellous,' says the Epicurean in Cicero, 'that one soothsayer (*haruspex*) can look another in

the face without laughing.' The Roman wits made divination the favorite subject of their ridicule. Ovid made the fables of the gods—the popular ascription of immoral deeds to them—the theme of his mocking *Metamorphoses*; and in his most immoral poem he proposed Jupiter as a model of vice. With an irony, not unlike that of Isaiah, Horace described the carpenter as deliberating whether he should convert a shapeless log into a bench or into a god. Cicero mentions the assenting plaudits with which the people heard the lines of Ennius, declaring that the gods, though real beings, take no care for the things of man.

[*De Div. ii.*, 50 :—*An noster Ennius? qui magno plausu loquitur adsentiente populo:*

*'Ego deum genus esse semper dixi et dicam cœlitum,
Sed eos non curare opinor, quid agat humanum genus.'*]

Many other examples might be adduced to show the failure of the Roman religion to supply the sources of their moral life. Lacking the element of growth and having no self-perpetuating power, it could not keep pace with the advancement of the other factors of civilization, and at last became completely transmuted into a political power.

Turning from religion to philosophy, we find that the latter performed its part nobly towards upholding the principles of morality. In setting this subject clearly before our minds, we cannot do better than to quote the discriminating language of Dean Milman: "In the two prevalent systems of philosophy, the Epicurean and the Stoic, appears a striking assimilation to the national character of the two predominant races which constituted the larger part of the Roman world. The Epicurean, with its subtle metaphysics, its abstract notions of the Deity, its imaginative materialism, its milder and more pleasurable morals, and, perhaps, its propensity to degenerate into indolence and sensuality, was kindred and congenial to that of Greece, and the Grecian part of the Roman society. The Stoic, with its more practical character, its mental strength and self-confidence, its fatalism, its universally diffused and all-governing

Deity, the soul of the universe (of which the political power of the all-ruling republic might appear an image), bore the same analogy to that of Rome." We may add, that "in the Roman Empire, almost every great character, almost every effort in the cause of liberty, emanated from the ranks of Stoicism, while Epicureanism was continually identified with corruption and tyranny." Whilst Rome produced no great philosopher in the proper sense of that term, there were not lacking men of broad intellectual grasp, who could clearly apprehend the principles underlying the philosophical speculations of the Greeks, and recast them in such form as to make them available for practical purposes. Of the various doctrines embraced in the system of Stoicism, the theory of virtue, and the paramount importance attached to the power of the will, are especially noteworthy. The idea of duty was fostered and developed by the Roman spirit and legislation as never before, and practical morality was carried as far, perhaps, as was possible by the unaided human reason and will.

The *De Officiis* of Cicero deservedly ranks among the noblest treatises on morals to be found in the whole range of pagan literature, and it was avowedly an expansion of a work by Panætius, the founder of Roman Stoicism. Pagan antiquity has left us few grander examples than that of Epictetus, the sickly, deformed slave of a monster who was notorious for his barbarity. Enfranchised by Domitian late in life, he was soon driven into exile, and while sounding the very abyss of human misery and looking forward to death as to simple decomposition, he was yet so filled with the sense of the divine presence, we are told, that his life was one continual hymn to Providence; and his writings and his example, which appeared to his contemporaries almost the ideal of human goodness, have not lost their consoling power through all the ages and the vicissitudes they have survived. Thrasea, Helvidius, Cornutus, and a crowd of others, who had adopted Stoicism as a religion, lived and, in many cases, died in obedience to its precepts, struggling for the liberties of their country in the darkest hours of tyranny.

The austere purity of the writings of Seneca and his school, is a fact probably unique in history, when we consider, on the one hand, the intense and undisguised depravity of the empire, and, on the other hand, the prominent position of most of the leading Stoics in the very centre of the stream. The splendor of the genius of Caesar never eclipses the moral grandeur of the vanquished Cato, and amid all the dramatic vicissitudes of civil war and of political convulsions, the supreme authority of moral distinctions was never entirely forgotten. However pressing the demand for brevity, no survey of Roman Stoicism would be even measurably complete without giving a prominent place to the last and most perfect representative of the whole school, Marcus Aurelius, whose portraiture has been drawn with singular felicity by Mr. Lecky: "He was, perhaps, as nearly a perfectly virtuous man as has ever appeared upon our world. Tried by the checkered events of a reign of nineteen years, presiding over a society that was profoundly corrupt, and over a city that was notorious for its license, the perfection of his character awed even calumny to silence, and the spontaneous sentiment of his people proclaimed him rather a god than a man. His life was passed in unremitting activity. For nearly twelve years he was absent with his armies in the distant provinces of the empire, and he discharged the duties of his great position with unwearied zeal. Yet few men have ever carried farther the virtue of little things, the delicate moral tact and the minute scruples, which, though often exhibited by women and secluded religionists, very rarely survive much contact with active life. The solicitude with which he endeavored to persuade two zealous rhetoricians to abstain during their debates from retorts that might destroy their friendship,—the careful gratitude with which, in a camp in Hungary, he recalled every moral obligation he could trace, even to the most obscure of his tutors,—his anxiety to avoid all pedantry and mannerism in his conduct, and to repel every voluptuous imagination from his mind,—his deep sense of the obligation of purity,—become all, I think, inexpressibly touching, when we

remember that they were exhibited by one who was the supreme ruler of the civilized globe, and who was continually engaged in the direction of the most gigantic affairs. He steadily resisted the temptation to use the authority of his high position for the arbitrary enforcement of his views of life and conduct upon his subjects. 'Never hope,' he once wrote, 'to realize Plato's Republic. Let it be sufficient that you have in some slight degree ameliorated mankind, and do not think that amelioration of small importance. Who can change the opinions of men? And without a change of sentiments, what can you make but reluctant slaves and hypocrites?' The principle of his virtue, like that of most of the best Romans, was the sense of duty, the conviction of the existence of a law of nature, to which it is the aim and purpose of our being to conform. Never, perhaps, had such active and unrelaxing virtue been united with so little enthusiasm and been cheered with so little illusion of success. 'There is but one thing,' he wrote, 'of real value,—to cultivate truth and justice, and to live without anger in the midst of lying and unjust men.' In the midst of the most appalling calamities he was struck down with a mortal illness. He died, as he long had lived, alone. Thus sank to rest, in clouds and darkness, the purest and gentlest spirit of all the pagan world, the most perfect model of the later Stoics."

We have been at particular pains to set forth in its fairest coloring this most pleasing flower grown upon the soil of pagan civilization in the sphere of morality, not only that we may behold the lofty pinnacle to which human endeavor may rise, but also that we may be the better prepared to discover the fatal weakness inherent in even the sublimest efforts put forth to solve the problem of life, without having recourse to a fountain of strength quite beyond the compass of man's natural powers. For, in spite of its practical character, its brilliant struggles, and its splendid exemplification in numerous historical personages, Stoicism never succeeded in gaining contact with the people, and consequently failed utterly as a moral agency to save the masses from the degradation into which they were

steadily sinking. And yet it is hardly possible that its influence did not penetrate to some extent into the lower ranks of society, but it had no power to lift them up and point them higher.

Jurisprudence was, perhaps, the department in which Stoicism rendered the most important service to popular morals, and it would be interesting to go into detail and trace the wonderful development the principle of law received in the Roman world. But it is not necessary, for this is a sphere of intellectual exertion and moral elevation, in which the superiority of the Romans over the Greeks and all other races is so firmly established as to be indisputable; and we may safely make the general assertion, that no subsequent age ever failed to recognize in the body of Roman laws the stable foundations upon which the orderly society of States and civilized governments might be securely reared. Rome gave laws to the world, and no one need be reminded of the intimate relation sustained by the organized forms of law to public morals. The discipline and the habit of subordination fostered by a military life contributed not a little to the pronounced success achieved in this particular. At any rate, it is in the province of law and legislation, the domain of administrative genius, that the Romans stand alone and unequalled among the nations of antiquity, and we question whether, in this respect, they have ever been surpassed in modern times. It is to this conspicuous element in Roman civilization, that we must in large measure attribute the marvellous material prosperity to which Rome attained, and the tenacity with which she held on to the proud title of "Empress of the World."

From the earliest times it was part of their system of education to require the boys to repeat by rote the code of the Decemvirs, and in the time of Cicero this was still the practice, and no doubt long afterwards. Thus, and in many other less direct ways, the habit of respect for, and obedience to, law was cultivated, and could not fail of adding a certain very marked degree of moral strength to the general tone of society. Many

reforms were effected during the empire, benevolent legislation was not uncommon, and the law as a moral agency did its very utmost towards saving the tottering fabric of Roman society from its impending doom.

When, now, we inquire what the state of public morality was, we are at once confronted with an overwhelming confirmation of what we have already foreshadowed, namely, the complete failure of the three leading conservators of public morals, religion, philosophy, and law. Of these, as we have seen, the religion had been converted into a mere engine of policy as part of the machinery of government; philosophy, with its ethical teaching and its goal centered in nothing higher than the ideal wise man, had no real point of contact with the populace; and the law, though rooted deep in the natural virtues of the normal Roman character, had shared in the degradation of the state when it became merged in the person of the emperor, and had in consequence lost its power for good in upholding the tone of public morals.

We are, then, entirely prepared to find morality conspicuous for its absence in the general life of the people, and hideous vice reigning unchecked throughout the eternal city. We have no desire to enter into particulars, nor can we stop to inquire what the moral tone of life in the provinces was, for, although there is sound truth in the sentiment of Varro, which Cowper has introduced into English literature: "Divine Providence made the country, but human art the city," yet, as the city represents the height of civilization, so it must stand also for the co-existing status of morality. Rome was the rallying point of all vice, of all folly, of all intellectual errors of the old world. The word of the Lord, "where a carcass is, there will the vultures be gathered together," applies most forcibly to Rome. Lucian, in the *Nigrinus*, paints the picture thus:—"Let him who loves riches and admires gold, who seeks earthly happiness in purple and in might, who, reared among parasites and slaves, has never had a conception of freedom, frankness and truth, who devotes himself to pleasure, full tables, drinking-

bouts, harlotry, sorcery, lies and frauds,—let him go to Rome." More can not be said, and less would compromise the truth.

Among the causes that impeded the normal development of the ancient virtues, nothing shows the degeneracy of the people of all classes more clearly than the gladiatorial games—the main amusement of rich and poor. "That not only men and women in an advanced period of civilization—men and women, who not only professed, but very frequently acted upon, a high code of morals—should have made the spectacle of bloodshed, the carnage and torture of men, their habitual amusement; that all this should have continued for centuries with scarcely a protest, is one of the most startling and appalling facts in moral history. And yet, there are not lacking traces of a milder spirit even in the amphitheatre. Drusus, the people complained, took too visible a pleasure in the sight of blood; Caligula was too curious in watching death in its last agonies; Caracalla, when a boy, won enthusiastic plaudits by shedding tears at the execution of criminals;" and many other similar examples might be cited. But these are only the faint murmurings of that deep under-current of human life which can never be quite hidden out of view. In spite of the best that can be said, and making all due allowance for obvious exaggerations in the writings of poets, moralists and historians, the pages of Varro, Pliny, Seneca, Juvenal, Suetonius, and others, "remain as an eternal witness of the abysses of depravity, the hideous cruelty, the hitherto unimagined extravagances of nameless lust"—even though their names be written in polished Greek characters—"that were then manifested on the Palatine, and cast a fearful light upon the moral chaos into which pagan society had sunk."

It was "in the midst of this darkness, that a still, small voice was heard out of the East, 'Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy-laden, and I will give you rest;' and after awhile the same voice was heard saying, 'God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life;' and, again, a Roman citizen of Tarsus cried, 'This is a faithful saying, and

worthy of all acceptation, that Jesus Christ came into the world to save sinners.' There was rest, then, for the weary and heavy-laden; there was a God, too, and life everlasting, for those who believed in Him and His Son, who had come into the world to save sinners; and so the new doctrine came to Rome. In that sluggish mass, the leaven was hid that was to throw the world into ferment; into that dark soil, in which so much that was precious had been interred, a grain of seed was cast, that was to grow into a stately tree overshadowing the earth."

From this time onward a new factor enters into the movement of human history, and at every subsequent stage civilization shows the impress of its moulding power. Virtue has been given its true norm, morality has been poised upon its proper centre in an unfailing and unchanging standard of purity and duty, and life has had set for itself its true end and goal in the glory of the resurrection.

"The so-heavy chain which galled mankind
Is shattered, and the noblest of us all
Must bow to the deliverer."—*Browning.*

The story of Epictetus is well known, how the old philosopher warned his master, who was beating him, that he would soon break his leg, and when the leg had been broken, calmly remarked, "I told you you would do so." Celsus quoted this in opposition to the Christians, asking, "Did your leader under suffering ever say anything so noble?" To which Origen finely replied, "He did what was nobler,—He kept silence." Here is a power that had never been dreamt of in the ancient philosophies,—a self-abnegation and sacrifice which rise into a heroism that for moral grandeur towers high above all that had ever gone before; and in our further considerations we cannot leave it out of account. Indeed to my mind, it is hardly possible, for the purposes of thought even, to conceive of morality as something disconnected with religion. When we speak of right and duty, we mean right and duty as determined by the teachings of the Christian religion, whose domain pre-eminently embraces everything that concerns the will. It is not to be supposed,

however, that, because this new principle has been working for eighteen hundred years and shedding its benign influences abroad in generous profusion, vice must necessarily have been blotted from the face of the earth. This has not been the case, and could not be, for the simple reason that man, by the very constitution of his being, is a free agent, and by nature prone to evil. Nothing is plainer than that vices have existed all through the Christian era, and still flourish to a most alarming extent. But one thing has undoubtedly been gained, and that is, the elevation of morality to such a lofty standard of purity, that the enormity of vice has been enhanced in a corresponding degree. Thus, a thousand forms of vice can only be justly classed as vices, because the ideal of duty is so infinitely higher than it ever was before, and a more rigid exaction of conformity of conduct thereto is felt to be laid upon us. We can merely allude to the important bearing of the Christian ideas of repentance and guilt upon the general question of human conduct, and the significance they have as qualifying factors in making up our final judgment.

It is altogether possible to discover, within the pale of Christian civilization, isolated cases of cruelty and other manifestations of wickedness fully as atrocious, in view of the difference in circumstances, as any recorded in the annals of pagan Rome; but this would prove nothing, except, perhaps, the lamentable depravity of human nature. I am quite certain that no sufficient evidence can be adduced to show that the general sentiment of the public acquiesces in the practice of the more flagrant forms of vice, as was unquestionably the case in the best days of Greece and Rome. The very laws against crime and immorality, whilst they reveal the sad necessity that underlies their enactment, at the same time reflect the popular spirit as manifestly and prevaillingly favorable to the repression of evil. It not unfrequently happens that, when for some reason the law fails of execution, punishment is swiftly meted out to the offender by self-constituted agents of justice in the interest of public morality. At any rate, no such combination of sensuality and

atrocities as meets us in pagan civilization would go unrebuked by the populace in our age.

It is easy to draw a very revolting picture of the state of public morals, and many good and earnest men see nothing but gloomy forebodings in the signs of the times. There is, no doubt, much cause for anxiety, but surely the recognition and the intelligent apprehension of such cause to any considerable extent ought to be sufficient to arouse into greater and more efficacious activity the counteracting forces of good. It is true the powers of the world are immense, and their general trend is towards the evil, but the powers of the world to come are infinite, and it seems as if they ought to prevail,—and prevail they will, even though it be by the ordeal of fire!

In the meantime, let it be borne in mind that the industrial, commercial, political, intellectual and religious forces of the world's life were never so intensely active as they are to-day, and hence the clashing of separate interests must be more apparent because more violent. In the rapid strides of progress that have been made in the various departments of life, we observe an ever-widening field of human activity, and, consequently, ever-increasing opportunities for corruption. The danger rests not so much in the existence of vice, as in the degree in which the general public acquiesces therein. And, whilst we have no reason to boast, we may surely say that, at least as far as overt crimes and heinous vices are concerned, we are still largely on the safe side.

There is a more subtle species of immorality, however, which the organized forms of law can never reach, and which may well cause us to pause and reflect. We refer to impurity of life and the greed for money.

Moral laxness in social life is unhappily too notorious to be lightly set aside, and for this there is no remedy outside of Christianity. "A few years ago a play by Alfred Tennyson was enacted in London, in which a typical atheist was represented as esteeming lightly the virtue of chastity. The evident intimation of the dramatist was that atheism tended strongly

toward immorality. A member of the British peerage thereupon arose in the stalls and denounced the play as a libel upon all free-thinkers, and in some subsequent public utterances fervently proclaimed chastity a cardinal doctrine of infidelity, of which he himself was a living proof. The sequel to this incident was recorded a few months ago (Jan. 22, 1887), when a Scottish court granted the wife of that peer a divorce on the ground of matrimonial infidelity."—(*N. Y. Tribune.*) When once the sanctity of the family-life is invaded and laid open to wide-spread desecration, then the fountain-head of all human society is corrupted and sends forth its foul stream into every channel. Horace uttered a profound truth, when he wrote the lines—Odes iii. vi. 17ff. : "Our times, prolific in sin, have first polluted marriage, and offspring, and homes ; from this fountain sprung the calamity which has flowed upon the country and the people."* And with all the light Horace had, the conclusion he reached was unavoidable, viz :—"What is there wasting Time does not impair? The age of our fathers, worse than that of our grandsires, has borne us yet more wicked, who in our turn are destined to beget a progeny more sinful still." †

The ancient philosophy could go no further, and according to its teaching there could be no other outcome. In its code of morals there was no place for that love and sympathy which play so large a part in modern society. Around the family hearth, hallowed by steady reference to the altar of the sanctuary, cluster in rich profusion those well-known principles which, "strong with the strength and immortal with the immortality" of divine love and absolute truth, constitute the only real moving and sustaining forces of moral purity. In maintaining steadfast

* *Fecunda culpæ sæcula nuptias
Primum inquinavere et genus et domos,
Hoc fonte derivata clades
In patriam populumque fluxit.*

† *Damnosa quid non imminuit dies?
Aetas parentum pejor avis tulit
Nos nequiores, nox daturos
Progeniem vitiosiore.*—*Ibid.* l. 45ff.

our fidelity to these principles, we rear an impregnable bulwark of defence against the disintegrating power of worldliness.

It must not be forgotten, in this connection, that no opportunity is lost to give the widest publicity to crime and all forms of vice as they occur, and are hunted out with "ghoulish glee" in all quarters of the globe. Thus, we have constantly set before us, in nauseating detail, pictures drawn from the seamy side of life, so that we can hardly escape becoming more or less biased in our judgment. There is too, unfortunately be it said, more than mere humor to be found in the following newspaper paragraph:—"In heaven, we are told, there is more joy over one sinner that repenteth than over ninety-and-nine who have never gone astray. It is just the other way here below. There is more joy over one righteous man who goes astray than over ninety-and-nine thousand sinners who have kept at it all their lives. It is consoling to reflect, however," the philosophic editor adds, "that this attention to a good man's life is an indirect compliment to goodness." We need not carry out this thought further; all we mean to say is, that, whilst vice is ever flaunted in the face of the public, acts of virtue are studiously denied an equally prominent place in making up the record of daily events. Humility, obedience, gentleness, patience, resignation, are all cardinal virtues of the Christian character,—and these, though we may well believe that they find daily exemplification in innumerable ways, are rarely brought to public notice. They do not, and cannot, have a place in statistical tables, and yet they are the very life-blood of public morality, and must be accorded due weight as such in every estimate of the state of public morals.

We have alluded to the greed for money as one of the most subtle sources of moral degradation. This is an evil that may well cause anxiety and cannot be overrated in its demoralizing tendencies. It extends its baneful ramifications into all classes of society, demanding for its service such singleness of devotion as to seriously threaten the destruction of those qualities and impulses that make for the higher and nobler interests of our

life. So fierce is the struggle for wealth, that even in its legitimate channels, it is possible to observe many evidences of deterioration in the moral standard. This is so plain, that we feel no hesitation in attaching to the familiar business-maxim, "Competition is the life of trade," its corollary in the words, "it is also the death of honesty in trade." Mrs. Helen Campbell, who has been investigating with painstaking care the condition of the working women in New York, is authority for the startling statement made to her by a member of one of the most reputable business houses of that city, "that it is utterly impossible to carry on a successful business in these days without lying and cheating in some form." Let us hope, however, that this does not fairly represent the moral standard dominant in the great world of trade, in which it is quite certain there are to be found thousands upon thousands of men of the strictest honesty and of irreproachable character. Still, there is ground for alarm; and both in and out of the regular channels of trade the temptations to transgression are so numerous, that it is not surprising that the annals of vice and crime should be crowded with the names of victims whose fall must be traced to this prolific source. We cannot stop to show the responsibility attaching to the possession of great wealth and the ungodly abuse of the same. Let us not, however, withhold from wealth the meed of praise that justly belongs to it for the vast amount of good that has been accomplished by its means. Besides the great industrial establishments that dot our land—and they are moral agencies of no mean proportions,—we owe to wealth the most magnificent monuments of benevolence and philanthropy the world has ever seen,—hospitals without number, asylums for the destitute and infirm, homes and orphanages, institutions of learning, churches and missionary operations, great charitable enterprises of every description, the ready relief funds freely raised in cases of calamity by earthquake, fire and water, and countless more private efforts constantly put forth for the amelioration of mankind. These are indications that speak of better things, and lead us to cherish the hope that

there is no inconsiderable saving element still resident in the spirit of the age.

Let this prepare the way for the conclusion we have come to, namely : *first*, that the Roman civilization, though morally of a higher order than the Grecian, and embodying in good part the results attained by the Greeks, was, when compared with modern civilization, on a much lower plane in the department of morals, and ended in complete moral wreck. *Second*, in modern civilization the moral type has been raised to its highest point of excellence, and in spite of the increased difficulty experienced in realizing it in the average life of the people, a vast forward stride has been made from the highest point reached by the ancient world. We believe there is not a little reason for encouragement, and whilst evil is undoubtedly becoming worse, at least the good in the world, though not the world itself, is becoming better. From our point of view, the state of civilization depends upon, and its true test is to be sought in, the degree in which the divine ideas of right and duty are apprehended ; and the apprehension of right and duty depends upon the extent to which Christ rules in the hearts of men that constitute the nations of the earth.

II.

MELANCHTHON'S THEOLOGY.

BY PHILIP SCHAFF, D.D., LL.D.

WHILE Luther translated the New Testament on the Wartburg, Melanchthon prepared the first system of Protestant theology at Wittenberg. Both drew from the same fountain, and labored for the same end, but in different ways. Luther built up the Reformation among the people in the German tongue; Melanchthon gave it methodical shape for scholars by his Latin writings. The former worked in the quarries, and cut the rough blocks of granite; the latter constructed the blocks into a habitable building. Luther expressed a modest self-estimate, and a high estimate of his friend, when he said that his superiority was more "in the "rhetorical way," while Melanchthon was "a better logician and reasoner."

Melanchthon finished his "Theological Common-Places," or Ground-Thoughts, (*Loci Communes* or *Loci Theologici*), in April, 1521, and sent the proof-sheets to Luther on the Wartburg. They appeared for the first time before the close of that year.*

* Under the title: *Loci communes rerum theologicarum seu hypotyposes theologicæ*. Wittenberg, 1521. Bindseil puts the publication in December. I have a copy of the Leipzig ed. of M.D.LIX., which numbers 858 pages without indices and bears the title: *Loci Præcipui Theologici. Nunc denuo cura et diligentia summa recogniti, multisque in locis copiose illustrati, cum appendice disputationis de conjugio*, etc. The 21st vol. of the "Corpus Reformatorum" (1106 fol. pages) is devoted to the various editions of Melanchthon's *Loci Theologici*, and gives bibliographical lists (fol. 59 sqq.; 561 sqq.), and also an earlier outline from an unpublished MS. Comp. CARL SCHMIDT, *Phil. Mel.*, pp. 64-75; and on Melanchthon's doctrinal changes, SCHAFF, *Creeds of Christendom*, vol. I. 261 sqq.

This book marks an epoch in the history of theology. It grew out of exegetical lectures on the Epistle to the Romans, the Magna Charta of the evangelical system. It is an exposition of the leading doctrines of sin and grace, repentance and salvation. It is clear, fresh, thoroughly biblical, and practical. Its main object is to show that man cannot be saved by works of the law or by his own merits, but only by the free grace of God in Christ as revealed in the gospel. It presents the living soul of divinity, in striking contrast to the dry bones of degenerate scholasticism with its endless theses, antitheses, definitions, divisions, and subdivisions.

The first edition was written in the interest of practical Christianity, rather than scientific theology. It is meagre in the range of topics, and defective in execution. It is confined to anthropology and soteriology, and barely mentions the metaphysical doctrines of the Trinity and the incarnation, as transcendent mysteries to be adored rather than curiously discussed. It has a polemical bearing against the Romanists, in view of the recent condemnation of Luther by the Sorbonne. It also contains some crude and extreme opinions which the author afterwards abandoned. Altogether in its first shape it was an unripe production, though most remarkable if we consider the youth of the author, who was then only twenty-four years of age.

Melancthon shared at first Luther's antipathy to scholastic theology; but he learned to distinguish between pure and legitimate scholasticism and a barren formalism, as also between the Aristotelian philosophy itself and the skeleton of it which was worshiped as an idol in the universities at that time. He knew especially the value of Aristotle's ethics, wrote a commentary on the same (1529), and made important original contributions to the science of Christian ethics in his *Philosophiæ Moralis Epitome* (1535).*

Under his improving hand, the *Loci* assumed in subsequent

* See his ethical writings in vol. XVI. of his *Opera*, in the "Corp. Reform.," and a discussion of their merits in Wuttke's *Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre*, 3d ed. (1874), 148 sqq.

editions the proportions of a full, mature and well-proportioned system, stated in calm, clear, dignified language, freed from polemics against the Sorbonne and contemptuous flings at the schoolmen and fathers. He embraced in twenty-four chapters all the usual topics from God and the creation to the resurrection of the body, with a concluding chapter on Christian liberty. He approached the scholastic method, and even ventured, in opposition to the Anti-Trinitarians, on a new speculative proof of the Holy Trinity from psychological analogies. He never forsakes the scriptural basis, but occasionally quotes also the Fathers to show their supposed or real agreement with evangelical doctrines.

Melanchthon's theology, like that of Luther, grew from step to step in the heat of controversy. Calvin's Institutes came finished from his brain, like Minerva out of the head of Jupiter.

The *Loci* prepared the way for the Augsburg Confession (1530), in which Melanchthon gave to the leading doctrines official shape and symbolical authority for the Lutheran Church. But he did not stop there, and passed through several changes, which we must anticipate in order to form a proper estimate of that work.

The editions of his theological manual are divided into three classes: 1, those from 1521 to 1535; 2, those from 1535 to 1544; 3, those from 1544 to 1559. The edition of 1535 (dedicated to King Henry VIII. of England, and translated into German by Justus Jonas) was a thorough revision. This and the editions which followed embody, besides additions in matter and improvements in style, important modifications of his views on predestination and free will, on the real presence, and on justification by faith. He gave up necessitarianism for synergism, the corporeal presence in the eucharist for a spiritual real presence, and solifidianism for the necessity of good works. In the first and third article he made an approach to the Roman-Catholic system, in the second to Calvinism.

The changes were the results of his continued study of the Bible and the Fathers, and his personal conference with Roman and Reformed divines at Augsburg and in the colloquies of Frankfort, Hagenau, Worms and Ratisbon. He calls them elucidations of obscurities, moderations of extreme views, and sober second thoughts.*

1. He denied at first, with Luther and Augustin, all freedom of the human will in spiritual things.† He even held the Stoic doctrine of the necessary occurrence of all actions, bad as well as good, including the adultery of David and the treason of Judas as well as the conversion of Paul.‡

But on closer examination, and partly under the influence of Erasmus, he abandoned this Stoic fatalism as a dangerous error, inconsistent with Christianity and morality. He taught instead a co-operation of the divine and human will in the work of conversion; thus anticipating Arminianism, and approaching the older semi-Pelagianism, but giving the initiative to divine grace. "God," he said in 1535, "is not the cause of sin, and does not will sin; but the will of the Devil and the will of man are the causes of sin." Human nature is radically, but not absolutely and hopelessly, corrupt; it cannot without the aid of the Holy Spirit produce spiritual affections such as the fear and love of God, and true obedience; but it can accept or reject divine grace. God precedes, calls, moves, supports us; but we must follow, and not

* See his letters to his friend Camerarius, 2 Sept. 1535 ("Corp. Ref." II. 936), and Dec. 24, 1535 (ib. II. 1027): "*Ego nunc in meis Locis multa mitigavi.*" . . . "*In Locis meis videor habere δευτερας φρονιδας.*" His letters are interspersed with Greek words and classical reminiscences.

† *Loc. Theol.* 1521, A. 7: "*Quandoquidem omnia quæ eveniunt, necessario juxta divinam prædestinationem eveniunt nulla est voluntatis nostræ libertas.*" He refers to Rom. 9 and 11 and Matt. 10: 29.

‡ In his *Com. in Ep. ad Roman.*, 1524, cap. 8: "*Itaque sit hæc certa sententia, a Deo fieri omnia tam bona quam mala. . . . Constat Deum omnia facere non permissive sed potenter,—ita ut sit ejus proprium opus Judæ proditionis, sicut Pauli vocatio.*" Luther published this commentary without Melancthon's knowledge, and humorously dedicated it to him.

resist. Three causes concur in the conversion,—the word of God, the Holy Spirit and the will of man. Melanchthon quotes from the Greek fathers who lay great stress on human freedom, and he accepts Chrysostom's sentence: "God draws the willing."

He intimated this synergistic view in the eighteenth article of the altered Augsburg Confession, and in the German edition of the Apology of the Confession. But he continued to deny the meritoriousness of good works; and in the colloquy of Worms, 1557, he declined to condemn the doctrine of the slavery of the human will, because Luther had adhered to it to the end. He was willing to tolerate it as a theological opinion, although he himself had rejected it.

2. As to the Lord's Supper, he first accepted Luther's view under the impression that it was supported by the ancient Church. But in this he was shaken by Œcolampadius, who proved (1530) that the fathers held different opinions, and that Augustin did not teach an oral manducation. After 1534 he virtually gave up for himself, though he would not condemn and exclude, the conception of a corporeal presence and oral manducation of the body and blood of Christ; and laid the main stress on the spiritual, yet real presence and communion with Christ.

He changed the tenth article of the Augsburg Confession in 1540, and made it acceptable to Reformed divines by omitting the anti-Zwinglian clause. But he never accepted the Zwinglian theory of a mere commemoration. His later eucharistic theory closely approached that of Calvin; while on the subject of predestination and free will he differed from him. Calvin, who had written a preface to the French translation of the *Loci Theologici*, expressed, in private letters, his surprise that so great a theologian could reject the Scripture doctrine of eternal predestination; yet they maintained an intimate friendship to the end, and proved that theological differences need not prevent religious harmony and fraternal fellowship.

3. Melancthon never surrendered the doctrine of justification by faith, but he laid in his later years, in opposition to antinomian excesses, greater stress on the necessity of good works of faith, not indeed as a condition of salvation, and in a sense of acquiring merit, but as an indispensable proof of the duty of obedience to the divine will.

These doctrinal changes gave rise to bitter controversies after Luther's death, and were ultimately rejected in the Formula of Concord (1577), but revived again at a later period. Luther himself never adopted and never openly opposed them.

The *Loci* of Melancthon met from the start with extraordinary favor. Edition after edition appeared in Wittenberg during the author's lifetime, the last from his own hand in the year 1559, besides a number of contemporaneous reprints at Basel, Hagenau, Strassburg, Frankfurt, Leipzig, Halle, and many editions after his death.

Luther had an extravagant opinion of them, and even declared them worthy of a place in the Canon.* He thought that his translation of the Bible, and Melancthon's *Loci*, were the best outfit of a theologian, and almost superseded all other books.†

* "*Invictus libellus non solum immortalitate, sed quoque canone ecclesiastico dignus.*" In the beginning of *De Servo Arbitrio* (1525), against Erasmus.

† He says in his *Tischreden* (Erl. ed., LIX. 288 sq.): "*Wer itzt ein Theologus will werden, der hat grosse Vorthail. Denn erstlich hat er die Bibel, die ist nu so klar, dass er sie kann lesen ohne alle Hinderung. Darnach lese er darzu die locos communes Philippi; die lese er fleissig und wohl, also dass er sie gar im Kopfe habe. Wenn er die zwei Stücke hat, so ist er ein Theologus, dem weder der Teufel noch kein Ketzer etwas abbrechen kann, und ihm stehet die ganze Theologia offen, dass er Alles, was er will, darnach lesen kann ad ædificationem. Und wenn er will, so mag er auch darzu lesen Philippi Melancthonis Commentarium in Epistolam Pauli ad Romanos. Lieset er alsdenn darzu meinen Commentarium in Epistolam ad Galatas und in Deuteronomium, so gebe ich ihm denn eloquentiam et copiam verborum. Ihr findet kein Buch unter allen seinen Büchern, da die summa religionis oder die ganze Theologia so fein bei einander ist, als in den locis communi-*

The *Loci* became the text-book of Lutheran theology in the universities, and took the place of Peter Lombard's *Senten- tences*. Strigel and Chemnitz wrote commentaries on them. Leonhard Hutter likewise followed them till he published a more orthodox compend (1610) which threw them into the shade and even out of use during the seventeenth century.

The theological manual of Melanchthon proved a great help to the Reformation. The Romanists felt its power. Emser called it a new Koran and a pest. In opposition to them, he and Eck wrote *Loci Catholici*.*

Melanchthon's *Loci* are the ablest theological system of the Lutheran Church in the sixteenth century. Calvin's *Institutes* (1536) equal them in freshness and fervor, and surpass them in completeness, logical order, philosophical grasp, and classical finish.

It is remarkable that the first and greatest dogmatic systems of the Reformation proceeded from lay-theologians who were never ordained by human hands, but received the unction from on high ; so the twelve apostles were not baptized with water, but with the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost.

bus. Leset alle Patres und Sententiaros, so ist es doch Alles nichts dagegen. Non est melior liber post scripturam sanctam, quam ipsius loci communes. Philippus ist enger gespannt denn ich ; ille pugnat et docet ; ich bin mehr ein Rhetoricus oder ein Wäscher [Deutcher ?]"

* Eck's *Loci Communes adversus Lutheranos*, Landshut, 1525, passed through many editions.

III.

HEAVEN AND HELL.

BY REV. WALTER E. KREBS.

"If you be a good child, you will go up to heaven when you die; but if you be bad, you will go down to the bad place." This is usually the first lesson in theology learned by the child. The teacher is its mother or its father.

This may account for a view or feeling now almost universally prevalent. According to this view, there are three worlds: *heaven* above, all fitted up and complete; *hell* beneath, a fiery place of punishment; the *earth* between, a place of probation. When a man dies, his soul departs from the earth, and either goes up and is admitted into heaven, or is irremediably thrust down into hell.

Not only is the preaching also of the present day characterized, in some directions at least, by the same spirit, but all the other means of grace are made use of—yea, the Church itself is established in the world—for the sole purpose of saving men from hell and bringing them to heaven. As if this were not enough, even the resources of art are called in to impress this sentiment on the mind of the beholder, from "The Last Judgment," the master-piece of one of the greatest artists of the world, down to the productions of the merest dauber that hang in the form of maps on the walls of many a rustic home. Heaven is often thus portrayed as a magnificent city or gorgeous temple above the clouds, perhaps also with an exalted throne occupied by a grey-bearded old man, with his youthful son by his side and a dove hovering over their heads; hell below, as a deep, dark hole, belching forth fearful flames of

fire from its awful mouth, with perhaps a black being, tailed and horned, forking his unwilling victims into the dire abyss.

All this cannot but be surprising and annoying to him who considers that there is no warrant for it either in the book of nature or in the Holy Scriptures.

As to heaven being above and hell beneath, nature teaches that there is no absolute up and down, and that, to us inhabitants of this terrestrial sphere, *down* can mean only towards, and *up* away from, the centre of the earth. Does it never occur to the ordinary mind that this centre of the earth, which is a mass of liquid fire, cannot, at least at the present, be their imagined hell, because the material bodies of the wicked, the only part of them capable of being affected by material fire, are left behind on this superficial crust? The soul or spirit, the only thing which has departed this life, can burn, if burn at all, only in spiritual fire, which sort of fire is hardly to be found in the bowels of our planet. So also, if heaven is above, in the sense of being away from the centre of the earth, it must be, according to astronomy, either in one of the planets, suns, or fixed stars that make up the universe, or in the atmospherical or ethereal space that separates these large revolving globes. How does either this vast space or any of these physical spheres comport with the fixed-up heaven pictured in the minds of those who think that into it enter the spirits of the good as soon as they forsake their tenements of clay? Do these spirits, flitting about in the air or ether, realize a city with golden streets and with walls having gates of pearl? Or can these immaterial existences come into any sort of contact or connection with material worlds, be they ever so beautifully fitted up, having left behind them in this world those material parts by which alone such connection or contact is rendered possible? Let not the question here be raised, Whither, then, in the universe do the spirits of the departed go?—a question which it is not the province of this paper to consider, and which can be answered only when we know what spirit itself is; for the point to be observed is simply the fact that there is no warrant

in nature for the common belief of a heaven already fixed up above, and of a hell already fitted out below, for the reception of souls, bad and good, on separation from their bodies.

Neither is there any warrant in the Holy Scriptures. And this is a point worthy of longer consideration.

The inspired Book does speak of heaven, and, in addition to using the term as a synonym for the sky, the atmosphere, or the clouds, it speaks of heaven as a place as well as a state. In our present condition, however, we can hardly recognize or appreciate any distinction between the terms state and place when applied to the Eternal Spirit, to unembodied angels, to departed souls, or to spiritual human bodies. In denoting this spiritual place, the Bible uses the expressions, *heaven, the heaven, heavens, the heavens*, singular or plural, with or without the article, indiscriminately. Where is God? He is said to be in the heavens. "Our Father, who art in the heavens." So it was a custom with our Saviour to refer to God as His Father or our Father in heavens or in the heavens. That seems to be a place, but certainly a large one, unlimited and undefined. Perhaps, also, it denotes condition as much as place—"in the heavens," that is, in a state that is supermundane, "lest we should form any earthly conceptions of God's heavenly majesty." If only this expression and conception of "the heavens" could be substituted in the popular mind for the "heaven" that has found so deep a lodgment there, how many an error would be avoided!

So, too, the angels are said to be "in heaven," according to Matthew, or "in the heavens," according to Mark. A place, is it? No doubt; but is it a material place like ours? Then must they needs have material bodies like ours. Is not the term descriptive of their state as much as denominative of their location? For the only object of the main passage, in which "the angels in the heavens" are mentioned, is to point out the difference in condition between men of this world, who marry and are given in marriage, and the angels of that world, among whom such relationships cannot exist.

As to those who have departed this life, there is no mention nor example of a single soul *going to heaven* after forsaking the body. This is most remarkable when we consider that going to heaven after death seems to be to-day the end and aim of people's religion. The language and the thought are both utterly unscriptural. Look first at the greatest of all examples, our Lord Jesus Christ Himself. According to the Creed, his body was laid in the tomb, and his spirit descended into *hades*. We are not concerned here to know what "*hades*" is; it is enough to know that it is not *heaven*. According to the Scriptures, Jesus on the cross, having uttered a loud voice, *gave up the ghost* (Mark 15: 37); that day He was in *Paradise* (Luke 23: 43); He *gave up his spirit* (John 19: 30); in which (spirit) He went and preached to the spirits in *prison* (1 Peter 3: 19). Again, we are not concerned here to know what "*Paradise*" means, or "*prison*;" it is enough to know that "*heaven*" is not meant. Moreover, by the testimony of Peter, David had prophesied long before that the soul of Christ before His resurrection would not be left in *hades* (Acts 2: 31), which is certainly neither a heavenly state nor a heavenly place. So, then, it is unscriptural both in thought and language to say that Jesus died and went to heaven.

Of the proto-martyr Stephen it is beautifully but simply said, "he fell asleep." The sacred record does not declare whither his spirit went; but the circumstances immediately preceding his departure may throw some light on the subject. Just before he breathed his last he uttered the prayer, not "O God, take my soul to heaven," but "Lord Jesus, *receive my spirit*," in imitation of his Divine Master, the Lord Jesus Himself, who, just before expiring on the cross, exclaimed, "Father, into thy hands I commend my spirit." And just as His Father was "in the heavens," that is, in a state of exaltation, though He Himself descended into *hades*; so the spirit of Stephen went into the state of the dead, though the Jesus whom he invoked was, according to the statement in the 55th verse, in a

state of glory, that is, in "the heavens," which were "opened" in a supernatural vision to this first Christian martyr.

Of the death of Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, there is no historic account—there is only uncertain tradition. But he has left on authentic record important expressions respecting his approaching or prospective end. "The time of my departure is come. I have fought the good fight, I have finished the course, I have kept the faith." Does he continue, "Now I am ready to enter heaven?" No. "Henceforth *there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness.*" Righteousness, the perfection of his being, was the thing he looked to and aimed after. That was to be his crown. And further, this crown was not to be bestowed *immediately*, but was to be kept in reserve for him and given to him on the day of Christ's appearing. "There is laid up for me the crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous judge, shall give me *at that day.*" And still further, *all* the faithful will *then* be crowned together. "And not only to me, but also to all them that have loved his appearing."

This in his second epistle to Timothy, fourth chapter. Of the same purport is his expression of hope as recorded in the fifth chapter of second Corinthians. Here he speaks of the physical body, "the earthly house of our tabernacle," and of the resurrection body, "a building from God, a house not made with hands, eternal, in the heavens." In the physical body he groaned to be clothed upon with the resurrection body, and he entertained the wish that he might not be unclothed (in the disembodied state), but that what was mortal in the former might be swallowed up of the life that pertained to the latter body. This will take place at the coming of the Lord, when all shall be changed, though all shall not sleep, this corruptible putting on incorruption (1 Cor., 15: 52). To be absent from the physical body, and to put on the body of the resurrection is to be at home with the Lord. Here, then, again the apostle looks over the state between death and resurrection, and forward to "that day," the day of Christ's appearing. Wherefore also he "made it the aim" of his life, not to gain admission

into an external heaven, but "to be well-pleasing unto the Lord."

The same thought must have struggled in his mind when he also wrote to the Philippians (1 : 23), "Having the desire to depart and *be with Christ*." Even now, in the time of this mortal life, Christ is with His people, and they have fellowship with Him (1 Cor., 1 : 9; 1 John, 1 : 3), and whilst it may be true that this fellowship is of a higher nature in the disembodied state, yet it will reach its *highest* state of perfection only in the resurrection life. "Your life is hid with Christ in God.. When Christ, who is our life, shall be manifested, then shall ye also with him be manifested in glory."

Even in parable, Lazarus, the beggar, who, full of sores, had been laid at the rich man's gate, desiring to be fed with the crumbs that fell from the table, died, and, though a good opportunity for declaring that he went to heaven, it is significantly added, *was carried away by the angels into Abraham's bosom*.

In language how beautiful is the departure of some of the Old Testament saints described. "Abraham died, and *was gathered to his people*." The same is said of Ishmael, and Isaac, and Jacob, and Aaron, and Moses. As they were not all buried with their ancestors, the expression can be referred only to their souls. "David slept with his fathers, and was buried in the city of David." Here, "slept with his fathers" cannot be synonymous with "was buried," and in Acts 13 : 36, "laid unto his fathers" cannot be synonymous with "fell on sleep." "Slept with his fathers," then, must be spoken of the soul. Olshausen says it denotes his reception into the happy portion of hades. But whatever Olshausen or any other theologian may think, the voice of inspiration positively declares (Acts 2 : 34), that David did *not* ascend into the heavens.

In the mysterious narrative respecting the woman at Endor, who had a familiar spirit, variously explained though it be, Samuel, at all events, who had died and been buried, is represented as being disquieted and brought up, and prophesying that Saul and his sons, who were to be killed on the morrow,

would be with him the same day in the state in which he had been before he was disturbed.

There need be no difficulty in the case of the prophet Elijah, who was taken away from Elisha by chariots and horsemen of fire, and went up by a whirlwind into heaven. By "chariots and horsemen of fire" are very likely meant *angels*, seraphim and cherubim, in the brilliancy and power of glory, such as afterwards invisibly surrounded the mountain round about Elisha to protect him against the visible horses and chariots of the Syrian king, and referred to in Psalm 68: 17, as "twenty thousand, even thousands of thousands" in number. "Into heaven." A clear instance, one might say, of a human being going off to a distant planet or star fitted up and adorned as the happy abode of God, of angels, and of saints. To the contrary notwithstanding, what is there in this passage that in the least degree justifies any view of this kind? The reader, whose mind is divested of the current notion and filled with a sense of the biblical usage of the expression, cannot fail to realize that the *sky* or visible heavens is understood. For Elisha and fifty men of the sons of the prophets were the only witnesses and could, therefore, be the only reporters of this sublime scene. The fifty men feared that the Lord had taken him up only far enough to let him fall on some mountain or into some valley, and they scoured the country through for three days expecting to find his dead body. And Elisha himself, though well aware of the futility of the search, must have only known that his master disappeared in the heavens as he gazed upward to their apparent vault. And that for this reason, because, as far at least as the Scriptural record from Adam to Elijah goes, men did not talk because they did not know anything those days about going to hell and heaven, as we nowadays profess to know and talk. In this connection we may risibly yet reverently ask, how high at any rate could a whirlwind, which is a revolving mass of air, carry the prophet? Even when our Lord Jesus Christ Himself was taken up, *a cloud*, we are told, received Him out of sight of His disciples, and this the two men that stood by them in white

apparel declared to be *a going into heaven*. With the Saviour, this going into the heavens was a symbol of His exaltation, but with Elijah it may have been but a carrying away by the angels into Abraham's bosom, accompanied, for special reasons, with remarkable and miraculous external appearances.

But in that event the question may be naturally asked, What became of his earthly body? Angels, who are not possessed of bodies like ours, have yet the power, either at their own pleasure or by divine command, to appear in the form of human flesh and blood. Take, as an instance, the three angels that presented themselves to Abraham as he sat in his tent door. He took them to be ordinary travelers, so much did they look like men; he prepared for them a meal of bread and veal and butter and milk, *and they did eat*; they conversed with each other in human speech. If, then, unembodied spirits are able or allowed to assume and again lay aside the attributes of the human body, and thus to enter into and again to leave the state of human life, why should it be thought a hard thing with the Almighty to cause a human being, in a miraculous way and without dying, simply to leave in the earth that in him which is earthy, ashes to ashes, dust to dust, and, divested of all the materials of his frail house of clay, to enter the disembodied state of all the departed? God Himself, probably through the instrumentality of angels, disposed of the body of Moses, and no human being ever knew of his sepulchre. The same Divine Hand disposed of the body of Enoch also, of whose departure all that the Old Testament says is, "God took him," and the New Testament, "God translated him;" nowhere does it say to heaven, or even to Himself. What does this mean but that Enoch, as Elijah afterwards, passed over from the embodied to the disembodied state without undergoing the shock and the pains of physical dissolution common to all mankind? How could these two men take with them their image of the earthy, if it is true that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, and corruption inherit incorruption? And how could these two exchange their natural body for the spiritual body previous

to and independent of Christ, if it be true that Christ is the first fruits, then they that are Christ's at His coming? And further we positively know that they that are alive, that are left unto the coming of the Lord, shall be relieved very quickly, in a way as mysterious to us now as in the case of Elijah and Enoch, of the earthly elements of their bodies, for they shall be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump, and *shall be caught up in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air.*

There is no instance in the Holy Scriptures of any one dying and going to hell. In the Old Testament, hell, in the sense of gehenna, the place of eternal punishment, is not even once mentioned. It is only sheol, the same as hades, that is referred to at all; as, for example, when Jacob said, "I will go down to sheol to my son mourning"—not to heaven, or to hell, to which latter place especially the pious patriarch would hardly be consigned, but to the abode of the dead, whither he supposed his son Joseph had gone. In the New Testament record, Judas Iscariot, upon whom the Saviour pronounced the fearful woe, "good were it for that man if he had not been born," went and hanged himself, and falling headlong, he burst asunder in the midst, and all his bowels gushed out. Then, according to Peter (Acts 1: 25), *he went to his own place.* The rich man in the parable died and was buried, and not in gehenna, but in hades, he lifted up his eyes, being in torments.

Further also, as there is no instance on record in the Bible of persons going to heaven or to hell, in the current acceptation of those terms, so neither is there anywhere in its inspired pages any declaration or intimation, in the way of promise or threat, that persons must make it the aim of their lives to be admitted through the gates within the walls of the one, and not be thrust into the yawning abyss of the other. That men should ever have caught a different spirit—so plain are the teachings of Holy Scripture on this subject—is simply astounding.

Nothing adverse to this statement is to be found in the apocalypse of St. John, it may be remarked once for all, because its

figures and prophecies are not yet understood. The figurative description, taken by the reader in a literal sense, of the city having a wall of jasper, great and high, that lieth foursquare, its gates pearls and its street pure gold, and of the bottomless pit, out of which went up smoke as of a great furnace, and of the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone, has no doubt been the innocent occasion of painting in the minds of people those pictures of heaven and of hell which seem so indelibly impressed therein. And yet it is a matter of wonder that these pictures, apparently so clear in themselves, have never been blurred by the representation that the city came down out of heaven from God and was located in a new earth and a new heaven, and that there are brimstone and fire in heaven, as these devouring elements came from that quarter (Rev. 20 : 9 ; Luke 17 : 29) to consume Sodom and Gomorrha, and Gog and Magog. At best, these apocalyptic descriptions appear to be of things, not as they now are, but as they will be after the resurrection and general judgment.

"Great is your reward in heaven." This passage is sometimes loosely read, as though it were, "Heaven will be your reward." But no such sentiment is expressed. In that place your reward will be something else, and not the mere admission. In Matthew's Gospel it reads, "in the heavens," which expression means, when not the visible heavens, a state of glory. Not a simple entrance into an outward place, but this state of glory, reached by a life of religion here below, is the exceeding great reward. Parallel to this is the passage, "Lay up for yourselves treasures in heaven." Add faith to faith and virtue to virtue, and these treasures, in the form of your entire sanctification and consequent happiness, you will enter into possession of, with no possibility of ever losing, in the world to come. Certainly no one is exhorted to lay up possessions, spiritual though they be, in some nook in a place beyond the sky, to be handed to him when he passes through the pearly gates ! This prospect of future perfection, as the result of present obedience, is "the

hope which is laid up for you in the heavens," referred to by Paul in his letter to the Colossians.

There is but half a dozen of passages in the New Testament, in which mention is made of *hell*, in the sense of *gehenna*, the place of future punishment. "It is profitable for thee that one of thy members should perish, and not thy whole body go into hell." "Fear him which is able to destroy both soul and body in hell." There is then a hell; but it is referred to here only in connection with the general resurrection and judgment, for it is only "at that day" that the *body* of the wicked will or can enter that dread abode. There is nothing even hinted at respecting the time between this and that. Just as when the King shall say to those on the left hand, "Depart from me, ye cursed, into the eternal fire which is prepared for the devil and his angels," it will be only "when the Son of man shall come in his glory." The remaining four of the six scriptural passages merely inform us that he who shall say "Moreh" to his brother shall be in danger of the hell of fire; that the scribes and Pharisees, in making one proselyte, made him twofold more a son of hell than themselves; that it was a question how they could escape the judgment of hell, and that angels, when they sinned, were cast down to hell (in this case "Tartarus," which, however, is but the heathen name for *gehenna*). From all this nothing can be gathered either here or there that militates against the general spirit of the Scriptures concerning the disembodied state of the wicked.

Quite overwhelming is the testimony of inspiration, when it positively tells what, instead of heaven and hell as places, the true end and aim of religion is.

To God's ancient people nothing was ever said about heaven or hell. The reward of obedience was that it would be well with them in the promised land; and to the injunction, "Ye shall keep my commandments and do them," was this sublime addition, again and again repeated, "*I am the Lord.*" Surely the best reason to obey.

Repent and be baptized, is the Gospel injunction, not in order

to enter into heaven, but for *the remission of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost*. To one whose sins are unremitted and life unsanctified, the most perfect palace or city would be a perfect hell. He that believeth and is baptized shall be *saved*; he that believeth not shall be *condemned*. This do in remembrance of *me*. The Sacraments are not ladders to heaven, nor fire-escapes, but means of *grace*, which come down to us from the Lord out of the heavens. Blessed are the poor in spirit, not because they shall go to heaven when they die, but because they are *now* subjects of the kingdom of the heavens. Broad is the way that leadeth, not to hell, but to *destruction*; straitened is the way that leadeth, not to heaven, but unto *life*. Life is not mere existence, nor destruction annihilation, but the one is a state in which a person is right with himself and with all his environments, and the other a state in which he is out of joint.

"In my Father's house are many abiding-places; I go to *prepare a place for you*." Then the place for us is not yet ready. When will it be ready? When "I come again to receive you unto myself." How then can any one between this and that remove into the "place" before it is ready? Christ is now engaged in preparing it. But is He building in the city for each Christian, out of such precious materials forsooth as gems and gold, a magnificent residence, as a contractor erects a palace for a prince or a millionaire? Instead of that, He is in the heavens, at the right hand of the Father, as Head over all things to the Church, for the perfecting of the saints, unto the building up of His body, till we all attain unto the unity of the faith and of knowledge, and unto the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ. He, who has all power in heaven and earth for the purpose, is now bringing about the perfection of His people as a body. This glorious end will be reached at His second coming, in the benefits of which each individual member shall share, for then, and not until then, will his place be ready in the Father's house on high.

"Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee *the crown of life*"—not, "I will take thee to heaven." Is this to be a

crown of gold, studded with gems? No, this is a crown made up of *life*. The perfection of thy being will be the crown thou wilt wear, never fading, the result of all thine earthly toil. Even *after* the general judgment, when the sheep and the goats have been separated, each party going to its own everlasting abode, the state, not the place, is emphasized, "These shall go away into eternal *punishment* ; but the righteous into *eternal life*."

But why rehearse the whole Bible on this subject? From beginning to end it is evident that there is indeed a heaven, and a hell ; but that these terms are very rarely used as expressive of external places ; that they are more frequently indicative, as far as heaven at least is concerned, of state or condition ; that they are never set before us as objects, to be sought in case of the one, and to be escaped in case of the other, with the exception, perhaps, of one or two doubtful expressions ; that entrance into either, whether regarded as place or state, is not predicated of any one until after the second coming of Christ ; and that in the disembodied state the believer is in a condition of rest (Rev. 14 : 13) and comfort (Luke 16 : 25), and nearer to Christ than in his earthly life, and that the unbeliever is in a condition of torment and anguish, premonitory of the worm that dieth not and the fire that is not quenched.

If this, then, is the temper and teaching of the "only rule of faith and practice," why should Christian people make so much of heaven and hell in their talk, their thinking, and their feeling? Why should they end so many of their prayers, "And finally save us in heaven"? No prayer recorded in Scripture winds up in that way ; notably, the Lord's Prayer, "after which manner" they are enjoined upon to pray. Why sing so much of heaven, that land of pure delight, far away beyond the skies, instead of Christ and His great salvation, in the spirit of David's Psalms, and such hymns as the Gloria in Excelsis and the Te Deum? And why should preachers preach to men heaven and hell, instead of repentance, faith, and a godly life here, leading to blessedness and glory and perfection hereafter, and bidding them flee from the wrath to come?

And why should there be any difficulty or trouble respecting the condition of infants, idiots, and heathen in the disembodied state, who have neither accepted nor rejected Christ in this life? The trouble is one of our own creation. We require every soul, on leaving the body, at once either to enter through the gate into heaven, or be cast into the abyss of hell—thus either saved or lost, eternally and irrevocably. All dying infants are forever saved; all dying heathen are forever damned. Let us take down this baseless theory, and catch the spirit of the New Testament revelation. According to the Bible, there is no such thing as immediately going to heaven or to hell in the disembodied state. The souls of those who have accepted Christ are in rest and peace: those are in anguish who, when they had the opportunity, refused Him, thus committing the sin against the Holy Ghost, which shall not be forgiven, neither in this world, nor in that which is to come; while those who neither positively accepted nor wilfully rejected the Saviour, He never having been presented to them as such, and they being neither saved in heaven nor lost in hell, may yet have Him offered to them in the disembodied state. For the Gospel is to be preached to every creature under heaven, if not at one time then at another, and in Christ the seed of Abraham, an opportunity is to be given to all the families of the earth to be blessed, whether they flourished before or since His coming. In that case the good news must be proclaimed to some, yea, to many, that are dead, and, as they accept or reject, will they be judged on judgment day, and thus be on equal footing with men who accepted or rejected *in the flesh* (1 Peter 4: 6). According to the analogy of men in the flesh, it is fair to presume that some who died infants and heathen will be saved "at that day," and others be lost.

Here it may be asked, Why then go to the trouble and expense of sending the gospel to the heathen in this life? There is only one, but an irresistible answer to this question. The answer is one; but it has an internal and an external side. He who experiences the love of Christ and is tasting the sweets of

His salvation has an irrepressible impulse to extend the same joy to others, and therefore zealously obeys the divine command, based upon that natural impulse, "Go ye into all the world and preach my gospel to every creature." Such a man is controlled by a power somewhat like that which controls those who believe that all dying infants will be necessarily and immediately saved forever. Why, then, do they not put to death all their tender babes, and thus make sure of their eternal salvation, instead of allowing them to run the fearful risk of growing up in sin and being forever lost? To this question, also, there is but one, though a two-sided answer. Love to their children and the commandment of God: "Thou shalt not kill," based upon that love, irresistibly forbids them. The maternity of a child was on this principle discovered by the wise king of Israel, and the cause of missions is a sword of Solomon which reveals the Christianity of people to-day. It was a missionary spirit that animated the Son of God, and if any man have not the spirit of Christ, he is none of His. By telling of the bugaboo or black man that will come and take them, a mother may for a while scare her children into obedience; but sooner or later the maternal authority, the fiction being exposed, will come into contempt. The cause of missions is in danger of receiving a dangerous blow when the truth of revelation on this subject comes to be popularly apprehended, if it is now to be bolstered up by the invention—for it is nowhere taught in the Holy Scriptures—that all the dead heathen are now in a place of endless misery.

And how is it that those who believe—and their name is Legion—that the earth will be renovated and fitted up as the final abode of the saints, can, at the same time, hold that all the pious dead are *now* in heaven? A distinguished divine recently wrote: "God will make this a perfect world, and then divide it up among His saints;" and then, on the very same page: "The reason God lets so many children die is because they are too lovely to stay outside of Paradise."

And why should Christians in the sixth century have invented

a third spiritual world, giving it the name of "purgatory," of which their predecessors, for five hundred years back to the time of the inspired apostles, were profoundly ignorant, for the purpose of purging imperfect Christians by purifying fires and fitting them in a longer or shorter time for heaven, when the Bible teaches that this purification takes place in this world by the growth and development of the Church, in the perfection and glory of which as a whole all its faithful members shall, at one and the same time, share "at that day," those that died first having no precedence of those that died later (Heb. 11: 40), and those that are alive at His coming (1 Thess. 4: 15) having no precedence of those that had fallen asleep?

"My child, if you love and obey your Saviour, you will live and die happy; but if not, you will be miserable now and miserable forever," is substantially what a Christian parent should teach his Christian child.

Littlestown, Pa.

IV.

LIMIT OF PROBATION REVIEWED.

BY REV. N. S. STRASSBURGER.

WE propose to review the article prepared by Rev. W. Rupp, D.D., and headed, "Limit of Probation," which appeared in the October number of the REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW, 1886, pp. 518-546. We shall endeavor to point out plainly and frankly, though kindly, at least, some of its propositions which we believe to be erroneous, and arguments which we consider to be fallacious. We admit that the article is written with considerable ability, and evinces an amount of research and knowledge, which are worthy of a better cause. It contains many propositions which are undoubtedly true and worthy of being laid seriously to heart by all who seek the truth; but it also contains not a few, which are unsatisfactory and dangerous. Truth is mixed with error, and they are often so delicately interwoven that they cannot easily be separated.

Dr. Rupp speaks of three different probations: 1, Is the probation of Adam in paradise. 2, Is the probation of all those persons, who hear the gospel in this world. 3, Is the probation after death of the heathen, who did not hear the gospel in this life. In some cases it is a probation *before* death, and in others a probation *after* death. The latter refers to those who live and die in heathen lands, the former to those who live and die in Christian lands.

In the beginning of his article he refers to predestination, as the leading idea of the Augustinian and Calvinistic theology. Probation, he says, is inconsistent with its teaching. If "the race has become a mass of perdition, out of which sovereign grace, by an exercise of irresistible power, saves some individ-

uals and leaves others to perish," then man has lost all moral freedom. He is no more a free agent. Those who are saved and those who are lost stand alike in a mere passive relation, the former to the saving grace that is offered unto them, and the latter to the sovereign will, which has already fixed their destiny. Neither one can, by any effort on his part, change the decree which has gone forth determining his condition, not only in this life, but also in that which is to come. He is not allowed to choose and thus decide the great question for himself, but must simply accept it as decided for him long ago. In these circumstances there can be no probation "in any real sense."

The theory of future probation, which he proposes to discuss, seems to require another system of theology, which, instead of deciding all questions for man in advance, tying his hands and feet and limiting him in his operations, will allow him the free use of his will and permit him to think and act for himself in deciding the great question of life. He claims for him, as man, a certain prerogative, which he is to exercise freely in behalf of his own welfare. He therefore turns away from a system of theology, which is inconsistent with his theory of future probation, and adopts another, which is believed to be more in harmony with its principles and requirements. That he in his zeal to establish the claims of the cause he has espoused, should occasionally be led into error is not surprising.

The theory of future probation has a Pelagian tendency. This is evident to some extent, at least, from the article before us. In opposition to the doctrine of predestination, which determines every man's condition in the world to come, without consulting him, Dr. Rupp emphasizes not only his moral freedom, but also his privilege, either to accept or reject the offer of salvation. He says: "The idea of probation . . . implies that the issue of life, whether it be salvation or perdition, depends not merely upon the will of God, or upon any external force or circumstance, but upon personal decision and conduct."

p. 518. He endeavors to make his case, as it were, as strong as possible, for the purpose of asserting the contrary of predestination. To accomplish his purpose the more successfully, he lays, as we think, undue stress upon the ability of man in deciding for himself the question of his salvation. From the one extreme, where all depends upon the sovereign will and almighty power of God, and where man has no choice whatever, he seems to pass over to the other extreme, where all depends upon the supposed freedom and will of man. Here, as in other instances, as is well known, one extreme is apt to call forth another. Pelagianism refers all to the judgment and will of man, and not only allows him the privilege, but also admits his ability to choose and decide for himself independently of "divine operation" and co-operation. For such "divine operation" it is thought belongs to the Augustinian theory of salvation.*

Unfortunately, however, man is a sinner by nature and practice, and therefore not qualified to make a proper choice. Being under the influence and power of sin, his heart is depraved, his will perverted and his understanding darkened. He is "so corrupt that he is wholly incapable of doing any good, and inclined to all wickedness." He has a natural bias to disobedience and unrighteousness. He hates that which is good, and loves that which is evil. He is naturally and decidedly opposed to God and his kingdom. He takes no interest in His cause—no pleasure in His service. He is not spiritually, but carnally, minded. How can he, in these circumstances, be in a condition to make a happy choice when called upon to choose between eternal happiness and eternal misery?

His choice of righteousness also implies and requires an admission of sin on his part, a renunciation of himself, and a forsaking of his whole former life, together with the adoption of new principles and a new course of conduct. How can he make such a choice and pursue such a course, if the power of God's grace and Spirit are ignored, and man is required to rely upon

*See footnote, p. 519.

himself? As well may "the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots," as the natural man, by his unaided powers, make a happy choice between righteousness and unrighteousness. A certain predisposing influence in the form of divine grace and the Spirit of God, must be brought to bear upon him before he is prepared to accept the privileges of the gospel. The powers of the natural man seem to be relied upon as though they were sufficient to enable him to choose eternal life. The choice is represented as being the result, not of the grace and Spirit of God, but of his own will and judgment. The article accordingly speaks of man's ability of choosing and of the necessity of making a decision. We are told that though the sinner is not able to throw off the dominion of sin and save himself, yet, "*he is able of his own motion*, to accept the proffered grace or to reject it." Again we are told that a person, "*though sinful, still possesses the power of determination and choice*," p. 519.

True, Dr. Rupp speaks of "a process of divine culture and training," pp. 520-21. At first it might be supposed that it would furnish the necessary preparation to make the required choice. But upon examination it will be found that it takes place not before, but *after* the choice has been made. It can, therefore, not aid him in deciding the great question of choosing life or death. It is not designed to assist him in making this decision, for that, he says, would be "interfering with his self-determination, or doing injury to his freedom," p. 521. It is designed rather to prepare him for "a settled character, either a confirmation in righteousness, or fixedness in sin." Hence he speaks of God as being "engaged in educating and training him for his destiny, in directing the process of his development—in arranging the circumstances and applying the means adapted to the purpose of leading him to realize the proper idea of his existence," p. 521. "The process of his development," of which he speaks, refers to his progress in righteousness *after* he has accepted the offer on the terms of the gospel. Before man makes this important choice, he is to be left perfectly free, un-

influenced by any power brought to bear upon him from without, except so far as to hear the gospel. Any other influence exerted upon him, would be considered as interfering with his moral freedom.

What is here said of the Pelagian tendency of the theory of future probation, is confirmed by the opinion of Prof. Egbert C. Smith, who says: "This extended application of the word (*viz.* probation) is by some associated with purely individualistic, and more or less Pelagian, conceptions of human freedom and human sinfulness."*

The theory of future probation has also a Universalistic tendency. The article before us seems to furnish some proof of it. On page 532 it repeats at considerable length some of the principal arguments, which Universalists use in defending their favorite doctrine; and on pages 522-23 it tells us, "It is commonly acknowledged that it is difficult, if not impossible, to refute this view by simple reference to texts of Scripture. The passages which are usually quoted in opposition to it, Matt. 25: 46, Mark 3: 10 and 9: 47, and Rev. 14: 11, are not decisive, and may be explained in a manner consistent with the idea of universal salvation." Again, on the same page, it tells us, "But while the opinion of unlimited probation and of universal restitution might be supported by an exclusive consideration of the nature of God, and while single passages of Scripture might be so interpreted as to favor it, we believe that it encounters insuperable difficulties in the facts of human nature, and further that the general tenor of the teaching of the Bible is against it." We cheerfully give the respected author all the credit to which the last clause of this sentence entitles him. It is felt, however, that his lengthy and favorable remarks on the subject of Universalism are significant, and can be accounted for only on the supposition that he has to a certain extent, though no doubt unwittingly and unconsciously, been brought under the influence and power of the theory of future probation.

* *Homiletic Review*, April, 1886, p. 281.

That it has such a tendency is confirmed also by the opinion of Dr. West, who says: "Indeed I believe that it in many cases leads directly to Universalism, and always to a letting down of the standard of Christ." "The secret things belong to God, the things that are revealed to us and to our children." "As for the heathen, children and idiots, I am content to leave them where God has placed them. It is always dangerous to attempt to be wise beyond revelation."

These are quotations from the *Advance* with commendation by the *Christian Intelligencer*, the organ of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in America. Brother K., a correspondent of the *Messenger*, adds: "That Dr. West is right in believing that the speculation of future probation leads in many cases to Universalism, there can be no doubt. It is marvelous that men holding the Christian faith and professing an interest in the salvation of souls, should give expression to such dangerous sentiments."*

Rev. J. L. Withrow, D.D., says: "This hypothesis has evinced a strong capacity to advance in the direction of relieving all men of the fear of future retribution."†

Dr. Rupp says: "The gospel must be preached to every creature," p. 530. This proposition is incorrect and fallacious. It is no doubt intended to create the impression, that it is synonymous with the instruction Christ gave touching the general proclamation of the gospel; and upon the unwary and thoughtless, it may leave that impression. If the premises be granted, the logical conclusion is irresistible, that it will be preached also to the heathen, if not in this world, then in that which is to come. A moment's reflection, however, will be sufficient to convince any thoughtful mind that they are entirely different, and cannot by any fallacious reasoning be made to be synonymous.

"*Must*," is the strongest form that can be used in issuing a command. It is not the form that God uses in telling His

* *Messenger*, September 15, 1886, p. 2.

† *Homiletic Review*, June, 1886, p. 467.

children what to do, or not to do. To Adam in paradise he did not say, "thou *must* not eat," but, "thou *shalt* not eat;" and in case of his disobedience, he did not say, "thou *must* surely die," but, "thou *shalt* surely die," Gen. 2:17. The Decalogue in no case says, "*must*," but always "*shalt*." "Must" is the form which an unkind and tyrannical king uses in issuing his absolute mandates, which are to be obeyed under all circumstances, and from which there is no appeal.

The fallacy of the argument consists in making the preaching of the gospel an absolute command. Christ did not say that it "*must*" be preached to every creature. That would have been a harsh command, however benevolent the design might have been. He simply said: "Go ye into all the world and preach the gospel to every creature," Mark 16: 15. What he enjoined as a moral duty, Dr. Rupp ingeniously turns into an absolute command. If the gospel "*must*" be preached to every creature, *all men* will at one time have an opportunity to hear it, either before or after death. Such a command would at once settle the question of future probation. Strange that the advocates of this theory resort to such an incorrect and deceptive representation of Scripture in endeavoring to establish it. It, however, only betrays the weakness of their cause, and ought to be sufficient to remind them of their inability to maintain it.

Dr. Rupp says: "The probation in paradise, and the probation involved in the conditions of natural human life, are not final and decisive for any one," p. 531. From this general and unconditional proposition, we most respectfully dissent. We believe that the probation in paradise was final and decisive on the one hand for Adam himself. It was so final and decisive that his trial needed no renewal. He had but one, however terrible its results may have been. It was so final and decisive that he died, and thereby lost the favor of God, and subjected himself to temporal, spiritual and eternal death. It was so final and decisive that he lost the image of God, in which he had been created, and however heavy the loss may have been, it was

never restored. It was so final and decisive that Adam saw and admitted his guilt, and therefore hid himself "from the presence of the Lord God amongst the trees of the garden." It was so final and decisive that he was afterwards regarded by the Lord as a disobedient and ungrateful subject of his moral government, who had incurred his displeasure and was already undergoing a temporal punishment. It was so final and decisive that the Lord pronounced sentence of condemnation upon all who had participated in the fall. It was so final and decisive that Adam was cast out of the garden and never permitted to re-enter, however uncomfortable and barren the world without may have been, in comparison with paradise, which he had just left. It was so final and decisive that the Lord God "placed at the east of the garden of Eden Cherubims, and a flaming sword, which turned every way, to keep the way of the tree of life." Gen. 3 : 24. He thus effectually closed the garden to indicate that the probation in paradise was ended, and that he and man were separated and at variance.

We believe that the probation in paradise was also final and decisive, on the other hand, for all the descendants of Adam. He was the representative of the race, and his descendants, though as yet unborn, were potentially treasured up in him. What he said and did, was said and done not simply for himself, but also for them. It is by virtue of the relation they sustain to him as their representative, that they inherit the consequences of the fall. A tree that is cut down, carries with it in its fall all the leaves, flowers and fruit that are treasured up in it. Adam fell, and in his fall he carried with him all the members of the human family, of which he was the federal head. "In Adam all die." 1 Cor. 15 : 22. The probation in paradise was so final and decisive for them that they are born, not pure and holy as their progenitor was when he came from the hands of his Maker, but sinful and unholy. It was so final and decisive that they are not asked whether or not they will submit to pain and sorrow, suffering and misery; they are not consulted even as regards temporal death. It was so final and

decisive that it is not left to them to decide whether they will live in paradise or in the world, which is resting under a curse. These questions have been decided for them long ago, and they were decided not simply for a few, but for every one, without exception. No matter where a member of the family of Adam may be born, just so certainly as he is a member, so certainly is he a partaker of a corrupt nature and involved in the ruins of the fall. Was not the probation in paradise final and decisive for Adam and his descendants? It certainly was. And yet we are gravely told it was "not final and decisive for any one."

We believe also that "the probation involved in the condition of natural human life is final and decisive" for all those who have heard the gospel in this world. It is final and decisive for them, because they have already either accepted or rejected it, and having made a decision personally and deliberately, no other probation is needed, nor will another be granted. This statement is confirmed by Dr. Rupp's language. He says: "And in respect to the exercise of this power relatively to the offer of salvation in Christ, men are now on probation or trial, the issue depending on their own behavior." p. 520. "It is not a *second* probation that awaits men after death. Those who have had their decisive trial in this life, will have no other trial hereafter." "Those who have the gospel here in its fullness and purity, have all the conditions requisite in order to a decisive probation, and for them, if they wilfully reject Christ here, there will be no probation hereafter." p. 546. Does this language not plainly contradict his proposition that the probation involved in the condition of natural human life is not final and decisive for any one? Why will such persons not have another probation hereafter? Simply because their probation in this life was final and decisive. Is not "the probation involved in the conditions of natural human life final and decisive" for those who have heard the gospel? And yet we are told "not final and decisive for any one."

Perhaps, however, this is not what the respected author

means, although his language, which is somewhat indefinite, certainly includes all that we have said as regards "the probation in paradise, and the probation involved in the conditions of human life." Both are "final and decisive" in reference to this world. Possibly he may have reference to that which is to come, but he does not say so. He simply asserts, without any qualification, that these probations are not final and decisive. In the discussion of such an important question as the one under consideration, something more than a mere indefinite assertion is required. He, however, simply makes the assertion and lets it stand unsupported by any proof, and then expects his readers to accept it as true.

In opposition to his theory of future probation we offer the following passage of Scripture. St. Paul says: "Wherefore remember, that ye being in time past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time ye were without Christ, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world." Eph. 2: 11, 12. The Christians at Ephesus, to whom this epistle is addressed, were at one time Gentiles, and as such they were in a deplorable condition. Of what had they no hope? In the text and context the apostle speaks of their salvation "by grace through faith," and in reference to it he declares they had "*no hope*." Whilst the Jews were nigh, the Gentiles were afar off. Suppose they had died as Gentiles, would they have had a future probation? Does this language of St. Paul authorize such a supposition? Does it not rather cut off every prospect of hearing the gospel after death? Had there been a possibility or even a probability of such an offer, that would have been a "*hope*." The apostle, however, distinctly and positively says, "**HAVING NO HOPE.**" This declaration plainly refers not only to this world, but also to that which is to come. If it were limited to either one, they would still have had a "*hope*" in reference to the other. Hence, "*no hope*" necessarily covers both worlds.

And now what was true of the Gentiles at Ephesus, we believe to be equally true of all Gentiles, no matter when or where they may live. Being Gentiles they too are "*without Christ, having no hope, and without God in the world.*"

Dr. Rupp affirms: "There can be no settled character, no confirmation in righteousness, and no fixedness in sin, until there has been a decided acceptance or rejection of the highest good for which there is an aptitude in the soul." p. 531. This proposition is no doubt true as regards the righteous, but we doubt its correctness as regards the unrighteous. Inasmuch as man is a sinner by nature and practice, he can be delivered from his original and actual sins only on the terms of the gospel. He is required to believe in Jesus Christ, repent of his sins, be born of water and of the Spirit, and appropriate unto himself, by faith through the power of the Holy Ghost, the righteousness of Christ. The new life implanted in the heart in regeneration must be developed, and the believer grow "unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." The work of redemption, which began in regeneration and was carried forward in sanctification, becomes complete finally in glorification. He must be holy, for "without holiness no man shall see the Lord." Such a deliverance from the power and bondage of sin, is indeed necessary for his restoration to the favor of an offended God. All this implies and requires not only his acceptance of Christ on the terms of the gospel, but also his growth in grace and holiness.

A training on the part of the unrighteous is, however, not necessary to attain a "settled character," "a fixedness in sin." Not even is a rejection of the gospel necessary on their part, before they are prepared to be banished "from the presence of the Lord and from the glory of his power." The preparation for a settled character in wickedness, for which Dr. Rupp contends, rests on the assumption that God is *not* "terribly displeased with our original and actual sins," and that he will *not* "punish them temporally and eternally," until they have personally rejected the gospel that was offered unto them, and, in

addition to all, committed some heinous sin. That God does endeavor to redeem even the ungodly from the power and influence of sin and unbelief, is indeed a blessed truth, which encourages the minister of the gospel to preach faith and repentance even to the close of life. But such an effort on the part of God and man to save them if possible, is not necessary to secure a "settled character"—"a fixedness in sin," that they may be punished forever.

Jesus says: "He that believeth not is *condemned already*, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3:18. He says nothing of "a settled character," "a fixedness in sin," before He can or will condemn the ungodly. They are condemned *already* on account of their unbelief. Dr. Rupp seems to make no account of the curse of a violated law, under which they are resting from the beginning of their existence.

The fallacy of Dr. Rupp's argument consists in the assumption, that the righteous and the unrighteous must necessarily pass through the same process, either accept or reject, respectively, the gospel and enjoy the same "divine training," before either can be settled in character, the former "confirmed in righteousness" and the latter "fixed in sin." He apparently overlooks the fact that the latter, according to the declaration of the blessed Saviour, are "condemned already," without a rejection of the gospel, and without a "divine training."

Mercersburg students, who were permitted to hear the late Dr. Nevin preach in the Seminary Hall, may remember with what earnestness and emphasis he dwelt upon the guilt of man as a sinner and upon the heinousness of original sin. He frequently pointed out in graphic terms the terrible error of those persons, who are disposed to make light of the sin in which they were born, and suppose they must commit some great immoral act, before they can be condemned and lost. In a deep, guttural tone of his strong voice, accompanied with an appropriate gesture, he endeavored to emphasize the fatal delusion of such persons. And then to confirm what he had said

with all the ability at his command, he would quote such familiar and favorite passages of Scripture: "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God. That which is born of the flesh is flesh, and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit. Marvel not that I said unto thee, Ye must be born again." "He that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the name of the only begotten Son of God." John 3: 5-7, 18. He knew nothing of a character, which had to be "settled" by being "fixed in sin" before man is fit to be condemned and prepared to suffer the wrath of an offended God. Truly, that is a "New Theology" which ignores the guilt of original sin and insists upon a personal rejection of the offer of mercy and a "fixedness in sin," before the ungodly can be punished.

"In the day when God shall judge the secrets of men by *Jesus Christ according to my gospel.*" Rom. 2: 16. In reference to this passage of Scripture Dr. Rupp says: "But a judgment by Jesus Christ, according to the gospel, implies a previous knowledge of the gospel and an acquaintance with Christ," p. 533. If this be true, all the members of the human family without distinction, be they Gentiles, Jews or Christians, must hear the gospel and become acquainted with Jesus Christ, before they can be judged by Him on the last day. Their knowledge of the gospel and their acquaintance with the Judge would be two conditions of being brought into judgment, either for acquittal or condemnation. This would at once settle the question as regards the probation of the heathen after death. Does, however, a sentence of the Court, according to the civil law, imply a previous knowledge of the law and an acquaintance with the Judge? By no means.

The gospel expressly affirms, that Jesus Christ will be the Judge of the quick and the dead. He Himself says: "For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son." "And hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man." John 5: 22, 27. To the

Jews he said: "Do not think that I will accuse you to the Father: there is one that accuseth you, even Moses, in whom ye trust." Jno. 5: 45. The phrase "*according to my gospel*," means that the gospel, which St. Paul preached will be the *rule*, by which Jesus will judge those persons, who live under the gospel. The sentence pronounced will be agreeably to it. The apostle had just said: "For as many as have sinned without law shall also *perish* without law; and as many as have sinned in the law shall be judged by the law." Rom. 2: 12. Therefore the heathen will be judged by Jesus Christ "without law:" the Jews "by the law:" and Christians by the gospel. Men will be judged, not according to the amount of Scriptural knowledge they may possess, nor yet according to their acquaintance with Christ, but in accordance with the teachings of the gospel. How superficial and unsatisfactory, therefore, is the interpretation, that the phrase, "*according to my gospel*," "implies a previous knowledge of the gospel and an acquaintance with Christ." To resort to such an interpretation of Scripture, to support the theory he advocates, does not serve to recommend it.

Dr. Rupp says: "The idea that the Jew could have the historical or real Christ present to his faith, beholding Him, for instance, in the sacrifices and other institutions of the law, so that his faith would have been *essentially* the same as that of the Christians, we regard merely as an idle fancy," p. 538. In this sentence he speaks distinctly of the Jews, who had been favored with the Old Testament revelation and the sacrifices, daily and yearly, as they had been appointed by the Lord Himself through Moses. They had also from time to time been instructed by "holy men of God, who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost." They were a people, who exercised a faith, which in the case of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob and others is recognized as a saying faith. Was not the faith of the Jew as real as that is of the Christian? Did it not also centre in Christ, the great antitype of all Jewish sacrifices, rites and ceremonies? Is it not the nature of all true faith, whether in

the case of the Jew or the Christian, to bring Christ near to him?

In what respect was the faith of the Jew not *essentially* the same as that of the Christian? Was Christ not known to Old Testament saints as pre-eminently a historical Christ? Was He not connected with their history, as a nation, from its beginning? Was He not interwoven with all their promises and prophecies? Did not all their sacrifices and services revolve around Him as their centre? Did not all point to Him and proclaim his coming, till He finally appeared among them as the antitype of all their types and shadows? Why could not the pious Jews, by the power of their faith, behold Christ "in the sacrifices and other institutions of the law?" What else than the historical or real Christ could or did the Jews see in the Mosaic institutions? What else than the promised Messiah did God seek to hold up to them in all their divinely appointed services? Or did God fail to accomplish His object in the appointment of these "sacrifices and other institutions of the law?" Could, indeed, the Jews not behold Christ in all these divinely appointed means, designed to bring Him near to them? Either the Jews were deceived by a mere phantom, which floated before the eye of faith, or they were laboring under a fatal delusion as regards their faith itself.

Does not St. Paul again and again use the faith of the Jews as an example to illustrate the reality and power of that faith which he inculcates upon his fellow-Christians, which implies that they are substantially, yea "*essentially*" the same, not in name only, but also as to their constituent elements? Were the Jews unable by means of the "sacrifices and other institutions of the law," to apprehend and appropriate to themselves the promised Messiah as their Redeemer? Was the faith of the Jew a saving faith, if not "*essentially*" the same as that of the Christian?" If not, how could he be saved? Does the Christian, to be saved, require a faith "*essentially*" different from that which the Jew required for his salvation?

Again Dr. Rupp says: "We are distinctly told that even the

most eminent believers of the Old Testament dispensation in their day, received not the promise, God having provided some better thing concerning those of the New Testament dispensation, that the former should not be made perfect apart from the latter. (Heb. 11: 39, 40). But if this be true of Judaism, how much more must it be true of Heathenism?" p. 538. Why must it be much more true of Heathenism than it was of Judaism? The people were entirely dissimilar, except so far that they were sinners by nature and practice. The cases are not parallel.

The members of the Old Testament dispensation were in possession of the true revelation, and stood in covenant relations with God. "To them pertained the adoption and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the service of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed forever." Rom. 9: 4, 5. That they "received not the promise," was owing to the fact that the fullness of time had not yet come: and that they were not perfect without the Christians, was because, as the late Dr. Nevin was accustomed to say, the church is an organism, and as such it grows and will finally be completed and crowned as a whole. Its individual members will not at death, drop one by one finished and complete into heaven, as though they had passed through a machine.

And now what are the heathen as contrasted in this respect with the Jews? Being without a divine revelation, "without Christ, aliens from the commonwealth of Israel and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope and without God in the world," and guilty of gross idolatry, abominable superstition and wickedness, such only as the heathen can commit, they cannot for a moment be compared to the Jews. The distinction between the Jews on the one hand, and the Gentiles on the other, runs in well defined lines through the Old and the New Testaments, which are drawn not by man, but by the Lord Himself. And yet we are gravely told by Dr. Rupp that the heathen are "much more" necessary for the perfection of

Christians, than even the Jews were. That the believers of the New Testament could not be made perfect, without those of the Old Testament, is plainly affirmed by Scripture. For they constitute a component part of the kingdom of God. As such they were included in it from the time of Abraham. Christ and His apostles recognized them continually, and the Judge will not reject them on the last day.

But nothing of this kind is anywhere in the word of God, affirmed of the heathen. They were not necessary for the divine revelations and institutions under the Old Testament dispensation, neither were they for those under the New. On one occasion Jesus said: "I am not sent, but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel." Matt. 15: 24. And to His disciples He said: "Go not into the way of the Gentiles." Matt. 10: 5. Instead of being in either case a help to the kingdom of God, they were generally only a hindrance to it,—yea, a temptation to unbelief. Being always by far in the majority, they presented to God's people a bold and powerful front, by their idols and idolatry, their abominations and superstitions, and only too often did they succeed in overcoming the hosts of the Lord and leading them into the path of disobedience. And now such a people, "much more necessary than the Jews were for the perfection of the New Testament saints?" Verily, this idea we "regard merely as an idle fancy." However necessary a scaffold may be in the erection of a building, yet after it is erected and finished, the scaffold will soon disappear. Though some of the heathen may have been used as instruments in the extension of the Christian Church, yet after it is completed and they are not found incorporated in it, they too like a scaffold will disappear.

On page 545, Dr. Rupp says: "But if we admit an extension of the possibility of salvation beyond death in the case of the heathen, must we not then do so also in the case of many in Christian lands, and, perhaps, even in the case of some nominal Christians themselves?" He then asks, "What shall be said of such cases?" He answers by saying: "The fact of probation,

must necessarily be supposed to be continued in the spiritual realm." We, however, reply by saying in the language of Scripture: "And if the tree fall toward the south, or toward the north, in the place where the tree falleth, there it shall be." Eccl. 11 : 3. "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still; and he which is filthy, let him be filthy still." Rev. 22 : 11. After He has opened the door of future probation, it seems to be difficult, if not impossible for Him to close it again. The applications for admission are multiplying, and He, accordingly, allows "many in Christian lands," and even "some nominal Christians" to enter and enjoy the benefits of His hadeistic salvation. This theory affords a "welcome relief" for all who are in doubt as to their final salvation. With the door of future probation fully open, no fears as regards their ultimate success need be entertained. If even privileges have been abused, they can still be improved; if opportunities have been misspent, they can still be regained; if duties have been neglected, they can still be performed; and if mistakes have been made, they can still be corrected. Nothing has been lost that cannot be recovered. A glorious panacea for all the spiritual diseases of human life.

The theory of future probation advocated by Dr. Rupp ignores the body. Man consists of soul and body. God created him so in the beginning. They live together in this world, and both are designed for the same state beyond the grave. Both are sinful by nature and practice. Here they are under the influence and power of sin and unbelief. In death they are separated, the soul descends to hades, and the body goes down to the grave, where they respectively remain till on the morning of the resurrection. If now the offer of salvation is made to the heathen after death, is it not plain, that *only* the soul must either accept or reject eternal life, and thus by itself, without the co-operation of the body, decide the momentous question?

Did not soul and body co-operate in the act of disobedience in paradise? Though the tempter did directly address the soul in reference to the desirableness of eating of the forbidden

fruit, yet the body co-operated by taking the fruit and eating thereof. And so the body also co-operates, either directly or indirectly, in the commission of all our actual sins. Shall the body, which is equally guilty and alike involved in the ruins of the fall, be deprived of its co-operation in accepting or rejecting salvation? How can it co-operate whilst it is lying in a lifeless state in the grave? Justice would seem to require that it too, as well as the soul, should have an equal chance in giving a final decision.

It is well known that Jesus Christ had a body whilst in this world. In it He lived and labored, suffered and died, and with it He rose from the dead, and finally ascended to heaven. He took it with Him to glory. Would He, without a body, have been the Saviour we needed? By no means. His body was absolutely necessary to effect our salvation. That He has a body in heaven, and will finally appear in it, when He comes to raise the dead, change the living and judge the world, only shows its necessity.

The redemption which is offered unto *us in this world* makes due provision for the rights and wants of the body. It meets man when soul and body are yet united; and inasmuch as they co-operated in the commission of their actual sins, both are brought under the influence and power of the grace and Spirit of God. They thus have an opportunity to co-operate in accepting the gospel, and to work out their salvation with fear and trembling, and on the morning of the resurrection they will be re-united, and then crowned and glorified together in heaven. Such a redemption seems to be demanded by man, consisting of soul and body, and we know also that it is the redemption which a merciful God has provided for his people in this world.

Of such a co-operation on the part of soul and body after death in accepting or rejecting eternal life, the theory of probation knows nothing. How can it? For, according to its statement, the offer of salvation is transferred to the world of spirits, where the soul exists by itself; and then whilst absent from the

body, it shall decide the question of eternal happiness or misery. The body is thus entirely ignored, treated as though it were not a component part of man, and not destined for glory and immortality. It seems to be neither honest nor kind to throw all the responsibility upon the soul on the one hand, and to deprive the body of all co-operation on the other. The theory does apparently not consult the body; it makes no account of it. It is not sufficient to say, the body may likely in due time acquiesce in the decision of the soul. It is the unfair treatment, which the body receives in the whole transaction, of which we complain.*

Dr. Rupp asks: "What shall we say concerning the countless multitudes, who, in all ages have died without having had Christ thus revealed to them?" p. 539. Who asks him for an answer to this mysterious and unanswerable question? Surely the Lord did not ask His servant for an answer. Who then did ask? Was it an ecclesiastical judicatory or one of his parishioners, or did he himself propound the question? If prompted by the inquisitiveness of his own heart to answer it, he attempted to be wise above what is written. His admitted inability to establish his theory by passages of Scripture, instead of encouraging him to persevere in his researches, should rather rebuke him for his boldness to pry into those secrets, which God has not seen fit to reveal to man in this world.

A desire to answer this question betrays an unwillingness to leave the heathen in the hands of a wise, just and merciful God. "Shall not the Judge of all the earth do right?" Gen. 18: 25. Do not such inquiries into the hidden things of God betray at least a morbid desire to know them in advance? Their inability to answer the question ought to teach them their short-sightedness and admonish them to be content with what is revealed.

And pray what good can be accomplished by advocating

* Whilst we were preparing our article, an extract appeared in the *Messenger*, from the *Catholic World*, which contends that "the whole man must repent or the whole man cannot be saved." See *Messenger*, January 12, 1887, p. 4.

earnestly and learnedly the theory of future probation? Men who hear the gospel in this world cannot be benefited thereby; for they have but one trial. Yea, instead of being benefited, they may have their faith impaired; for we have already seen that it has a Pelagian and a Universalistic tendency. And the heathen cannot be benefited; for by preaching unto them the gospel (including this theory) they would only be debarred from their supposed privileges beyond the grave.

It is admitted by the advocates of the theory of future probation that it is not expressly taught in Scripture. "No plain thus 'saith the Lord' can be quoted in favor of it," p. 541. This of itself ought to be sufficient to bring it into discredit. The salvation, on the other hand, which is offered unto men in this world, has been the subject of revelation from the time of Adam in paradise down to Christ. Truly they have not been left in ignorance as regards the gospel, its claims and aptitude to their deepest spiritual wants; nor in doubt as regards privileges, duties and prospects. Whilst their salvation is full and specific in its revelations and instructions, in its promises and hopes, in its admonitions and warnings, that spoken of in *hades* on the other hand by this theory, is without any specific revelation, without any instruction, promise or warning. All is wrapped in unfathomable mystery and impenetrable darkness. Its advocates must rely upon suppositions and inferences, drawn often from disputed passages of Scripture. To be compelled to make such an admission, is not only extremely humiliating and discouraging, but also calculated to bring the cause into suspicion, as to its truthfulness and reliability.

Dr. Rupp seems to rejoice that the opponents of the theory of future probation cannot produce a plain "thus saith the Lord" in opposition to it. The burden of proof, however, rests not upon its opponents, but upon its *advocates*. Besides that, the Bible was not designed to teach a salvation that was to be accepted or rejected after death, but a salvation which was accomplished on *earth*, and which shall also be accepted or rejected by man on earth.

Dr. Rupp closes his article by saying: "The key on which

the preaching of this doctrine should be pitched is to be found in the text: 'Behold *now* is the accepted time; behold *now* is the day of salvation.' And again: 'To-day, if ye shall hear His voice harden not your hearts,'" p. 546. This is truly a most remarkable ending of such an article. After asserting again and again, that the heathen will have an offer of salvation after death, he closes by saying: "*Now* is the accepted time; *Now* is the day of salvation." With what propriety could he quote this language of Scripture, and apply it to the preaching of his theory? They do not harmonize. Does he not plainly contradict all he had said in reference to the salvation of the heathen after death? *Why Now*, if there is another acceptable time after death? *Why Now*, if there is another day of salvation beyond the grave? After wandering long and far, Dr. Rupp finally returns and settles down upon gospel ground by saying, "*Now*, not hereafter, much less after death, "is the accepted time:" "*Now*," not hereafter, much less beyond the grave, "is the day of salvation." This advice given by an inspired apostle and repeated by our respected author, is no doubt a safe and consistent direction. But, pray, what becomes now of his theory of future probation?

Following the example of Dr. Rupp, we too will close with a passage of Scripture. It reads thus: "For I testify unto every man that heareth the words of the prophecy of this book, If any man shall add unto these things, God shall add unto him the plagues that are written in this book." Rev. 22: 18. Do not the advocates of the theory of future probation seek to add another salvation to that which is offered unto us on earth? Theirs is altogether of a hadeistic character. Admitting that they cannot produce a single "thus saith the Lord" in favor of their theory, they endeavor to defend it with all the logical and theological ability at their command, and support it with conclusions drawn from their premises and inferences from disputed passages of Scripture, and in this way, as it were, seek to supplement the written Word. They are evidently not satisfied with what is written.

Allentown, Pa.

V.

* THE EXISTENCE OF GOD.

BY REV. S. Z. WEISER, D.D.

BEFORE we may hope to establish a lucid and conclusive argument in behalf of Theism—one that must strike with equal force both the intelligent believer and the honest skeptic, and swiftly enable them to appreciate its nature and excellence—certain general and universal principles must be assumed and acquiesced in, as ground common and acceptable to all order of minds, whether of like or of antagonistic trend. As travelers, commencing their routes from the same point, will again arrive at the same goal, sooner or later, whether they journey in the same or in opposite directions, should they continue their course far enough, even so must all earnest thinkers come to like conclusions, whatever their several inclinations may be, *provided* their Premises are the same, from which they severally begin and logically conduct their search after Truth.

All Science, of a general or universal bearing, embraces the Theistic question :—

* This essay is a free reproduction of the Abbot, John Frederick William Jerusalem, a German Theologian and Scientist, who was born at Osnabrück, 1709 ; educated at Leipzig and Leyden ; appointed Tutor to Prince Karl William Ferdinand von Braunschweig, and Court Preacher ; mitred in 1742 ; elected Vice-President of the Consistorium of Wolfenbüttel in 1771 ; and died September 2, 1789, on the day his son, Karl William, a prominent Jurist and Judge in Chancery at Wetzlar, committed *felo de se*, on account of unrequited love. The sad end of the young man is said to have given occasion to Goethe's "*Werther*."

The devout and learned Abbot published two volumes on "*The Fundamental Articles of Theism*," 1781-9, of which this article is principally built.

GOD :—OR NO GOD ?

Is there a Supreme Intelligent Being, who created the Universe? Or; Is the Universe the product of Eternal Zero? The result of Blind Chance?

If it be true, that "the Power behind the Throne" will always witness of itself, by proclaiming its own nature and kind through its works, the Universe itself must also exhibit its Progenitor in a handwriting clearly legible and authentic. A glance at its record, then, from whose examination an intelligent answer may be gained, is surely proper.

The Universe confronts man as an Empire of majesty, a realm of unity and of endless variety, which intuitively fills his soul with an oppressive ecstasy. Like a specter it haunts mankind with its grandeur, whether the eye is open to the Firmament above, or gazing on Nature around, or even closed on individual Personality within. Like an indigenous apparition, its presence is asserted with an emphasis that falls home from all sides. The exclamation of the Psalmist—"When I consider the Heavens!"—voices at once the emotions of the philosopher, the scientist, the peasant, every one. A mysterious power challenges his admiration, which poises the myriads of Spheres in the domain of Space after an unvarying Law; an amazing wisdom authenticates itself, which locates a host of Planets as Fixed Stars at infinite distances apart, whilst larger hosts again revolve around those, by a like simple Law; every one after an order in exact keeping with its peculiar constitution; which, still further, and by similar forces too, conducts the countless Planets through the celestial deep, without the remotest danger of conflict. Some unseen hand placed the Earth at just that interval from the Sun, where the normal measure of Light and Heat accrues, for the well-being of its creatures—when its locality might have been infinitely further away, or infinitely nearer by. By some directory its position must have been so determined as to assure it the annual changes from Spring to Summer, to Autumn and Winter, as well as a maximum population to all Zones and Latitudes. Some mystic bond holds

the Moon in wedded companionship with the Earth, after a stated waxing and waning scale, which keeps the Ocean in a perpetual ebb and flow, yet never suffering the waves of the one to overleap the shores of the other. Some accurate adjuster must have correlated the Level of the Sea to the Surface of the Land in such a way as not to allow the floods of the former to entomb the fields of the latter, through a too copious evaporation and rain-fall; nor to be parched by continuous droughts; but to be sufficiently watered from the clouds and flowing streams. Some Law there is, which controls the closely-allied elements of Air and Water, so that the former dare never lose its expansiveness, and the latter never acquire it—lest both be destroyed, but obliges each to retain its bulk and gravity; and which presides throughout all Nature, as well.

On the assumption, now, that there is no God, no Intelligent Free Being, to whom the majesty and order of the Universe may be traced, a very darkness enshrouds mankind; the Sphynx of Egypt still sits by the road-side, threatening to slay human reason; an unsolvable riddle continues to challenge a solution; and—alas! without the hope of a coming Oedipus.

At the foot of Nature's pyramid lies a boundless field of shapeless, unorganized matter—the raw material of the Kosmos. Ascending but a single step, the observer finds himself surrounded with minerals, metals, and crystals, formulated after the variegated hues of a Prism. Another round higher, the theater of variety, order and grandeur is enhanced as by a magician's wand, by a manifoldness of organizations in flowers, shrubs, and trees. A plastic hand differentiates after an ever uniform law, in an endless manner. Whilst stones and crystals remain unaltered, it may be from the dawn of Creation, preserving their stereotyped forms intact and betraying no marks of change or self-propagation, in the Vegetable Kingdom, on the contrary, all things are in state of continual transition. Here are Growth and Life of an infinite series. Though rooted in the same soil, and baptized by the same rain-drops, every individual member acquires its own peculiar color, taste and

odor, though promiscuously intergrown into a very wilderness. All grow, multiply, and die alike; yet each one stands *sui generis*, maintains its identity, observes its special season, remains specific in kind; all are different, though all are alike subject to the simplest uniformity of Law.

Ascending higher still, the horizon enlarges after a corresponding marvellous manner. Thus far the spectacle of a most ingenious MECHANISM confronted us, of striking variety and beauty. Yet, barring the subtle principle of Growth, the stillness of Death reigned throughout. Plants grow and die in their birth and cradle-places, without even becoming conscious of their own existence. Here, however, spontaneous *Motion*, the most subtle *Sensation*, and the most refined order of *Instinct* prevail. Though the same Matter is still at hand, and a very like process of organization—since Animals are born, grow and die as Plants do, after similar Laws. We, nevertheless, witness new forms, after an inconceivably larger scale of perfection. Here is Life endowed with Motion, Sensation and Instinct; and all arranged after a climax, even as in the sphere of vegetation again, which extends upwards, over graduated steps, on a flight of endless extension. As the simplest Plant is still part mineral, so is the simplest Animal manifestly yet part vegetable. Here are semi-animals, which elongate as shrubs and trees do; animals with but One Sense; animals with Five Senses; animals which die in their native habitats, whose shell is their World; whilst there are those too, which discern the most remote objects through their keen sight, hearing, and taste; animals as gigantic as the mountains, with those as well, for which a grain of land, a drop of water, or a single leaf, answers for a Universe. Yet each one is relatively perfect; its organs and limbs are ever in proportion to its whole body. Every one is rightly adapted to its native element, its mode of living, and its general destiny. The wisdom by which all its constituent parts are adjusted to each other, in every creature, as well as all again to Nature's entirety, it is simply impossible to fathom.

Notwithstanding this automatic restlessness, the same degree of order and harmony is preserved, which reigns throughout the Vegetable Kingdom. A graduated climax assigns each to its place after unalterable canons; the fixidity of Law is ineradicably indented into all the tablets of the realm, which preserves their species; there is no declension or degeneration—no commingling—no lapsing from their several orbits. All die; yet all resurrect and perpetuate themselves unceasingly again, and ever after a fixed proportion, and in exact ratio to their individual destinies, as well as in full harmony with Nature's plan. For every species there is unalterably set the same measure of strength, the same round of sensations, and the same period of duration.

There is no Intelligence to be discerned thus far, but there is at hand a mysterious, incomprehensible energy still, which acts with greater promptness and certitude than even Reason itself, whose substitute it is. All know their kind; their quarters; their methods of self-preservation and propagation; and with an exactness which baffles the wisest savant.

This manifoldness in Nature, besides, forms a chain, the initial link of which is attached to the simplest Plants, extends through the countless grades of vegetation, over into and up through the myriads of Animals until it reaches the Simian race. Each link is endowed with the power of self-action, however. "Nature abhors a vacuum;" nor does Nature repeat its work, but ever produces after a teleological plan. Where the naked eye closes its vision the magnifying lens and the telescope proffer their aid and discover still more Worlds for man. For all he knows, right here may be the half-way round on the ladder of Nature. Yet the chain is nowhere broken. Plants, Animals, Water, Planets, Suns, every sphere and realm exists for its neighboring sphere and realm, and all together form one organic whole—a perfect totality.

And man is a still greater marvel to himself. Through the vegetable kingdom he is linked on the one side of his being, a cousin-german to the Animal tribes. Like them he comes into

being; he subsists as they do; like them, he has his period of existence; he is, as they are, endowed with instincts; and, like them, he dies.

But, on the other side, he enjoys prerogatives, in form, organs, and capacities, which elevate him high over all the Animals. He is gifted with Reason and Free Will. Man stands as lord over an under-world. He is a Semi-God aside of all other orders of creatures in the Earth. All others exist for his sake, from the blade of grass to the cedar, from the silk-worm to the elephant. All are man's servants. Apart from him, Nature were yet a blank, unmeaning territory. The vine does not taste its own sweet juice, the flower does not enjoy its own sweet odor; the down of the silk-worm were only a shroud, but for him; the diamond would lie worthless in the mud, were man not here; the sheep bears its fleece for him, and the bee hives honey for man. In him, Life comes to a ripe head. In him Reason, Order, and Majesty illuminate Nature's kingdom, which were an Orphans'-Home, did he not indwell its chambers. He discerns its hidden halls; discovers its secret laws; creates new forms throughout its domains, from age to age; weighs the Planets; calculates their flight; measures their celestial deep; turns the Past into a Present, and To-day into the Morrow. Man's aspirations, anticipations, and powers know no limits; all within himself savors of the Endless—of the Eternal. In himself lies the spring of happiness and misery. He is his own Lawgiver and his own Judge. He praises and he blames himself; he acquits and he condemns himself: and his own verdict outweighs the eulogies of a thousand flatterers.

But whence this grand Kingdom of Wealth and Order, if no God dare be predicated—no Intelligent Free Being, who originated the Universe and subjected it to the Sovereignty of Law? If Nature is indeed the result of Chance, or the product of an iron Fate, we are made to gaze into a blank Night. A Mechanism confronts us, which contains myriads of wheels, every one of which performs its specifically assigned functions with the nicest accuracy, the totality of which yet knows neither Law-

maker nor End—a multitude of Means, without Ends ; Designs, without Designer ; a Kingdom, without a King ; Wisdom, without Intelligence ; Motion, without a Motor ; a World of Life emerging out of a Desert of Death, a Panorama of Order, born from Pandemonium of raging Anarchy ! Was there ever a thicker Darkness ? In spite of all Human Reason, man is made to look into the Night of Death. Man too, remains an incomprehensible paradox. A child of mortal progenitors, whose lineage dates through the eons of the ages, back into Eternity itself ; a being of all others the most enigmatical ; surrounded by fated environments, yet endowed with unlimited anticipations and cravings ; enriched with boundless capacities, yet destined to die in a moment as an embryo : a lord over lower beings and Creation too, yet subject to all the fatalities of an insect ; helpless as the dust, yet gifted with Divine powers ; a being crowned with the royalties of Intelligence and Reason, which may elevate him above the clouds, only to fall as food for worms, in a second ; chained by inviolable Laws, which own no Law-maker :—Man stands a paradox of paradoxes ; and of all enigmas, the most monstrous.

What advantages accrue to man, with all his boasted prerogatives ? Truth to tell, he is not a hair-breadth above the brute ; yea, he is more unfortunate and miserable, even, so long as his search after a Creator is not crowned with success. Conceded that he may indeed enjoy his creature-royalties for a season, God, or no God ; that these his high endowments are for the time at least an advantage, though no Supreme Being existed ; that he may pursue his pleasant chase after Truth thereby ; that his incentives remain to him just as vivid ; that his senses are just as alive ; that he taste many comforts and luxuries beyond the beast ; that the economy of Nature nevertheless preserves and conveys its wealth and benefits to him in far larger measure ; that his desires still remain in all their greater eagerness and wider compass ; and that, therefore, man is surely in advance of the animal, with its dull and stunted equipment.

Yet the ox has appeased all its craving by stilling its hunger.

The lion is at perfect ease, when the victim is swallowed. But man's desires are never satisfied. For him no such bounds are set. His imagination continues to create new enchantments. The brute seeks its food, and beyond it, nothing more; whilst man is capable of multiplying his tastes far above his ability to gratify them. The ox and the lion remain within their natural environments; but man transcends the boundaries of his present being. Nature has fixed no goal for him; has marked no limits which he may not transgress. He is lord over Nature herein, and may ignore or defy its mandates. He may pursue the phantoms which his soul is ever forming. Short of their extent, he knows of no boundaries. His Reason may indeed utter cautions; his conscience may warn him through alarming spectres. But why should he heed these? On the morrow he dies; and dead on the morrow, means forever dead. If there is no Supreme Being, surely, Death means Eternal Nihilism. And if this is man's Ultimatum, the lot of the beast were more desirable than his cravings and anticipations. He might then have escaped the haunting chimeras, which cease not to bid him follow the dictates of Reason and Conscience in all his actions; nor would he have endured the disappointments of his fertile and vain imagination; nor ever have known the pleasing but deceiving magnetism of Truth and Virtue; nor ever have anticipated the mirraging fields of Eternity; nor suffered any apprehensions of Death—or only momentarily tasted its ordeal when the slaughter-knife might forever free him from all its accidents. Man as he is, is ever in conflict with Death at every turn in Life. He stands under its terrorizing apprehensions, and annihilation following in the wake. And barely has he learned the alphabet of Nature at an untold cost, when he has but tasted the sweet attraction of Truth at long range, he is fated to shut his eyes forever on its realm. Is this the last end of man's royal equipment? Is this the meager reward for his severe struggles to build himself up in Integrity and Right? Better were the lot of the brute his own.

It is true, that with an exclusively *animal* nature, man could

not have contained the nobler prerogatives, which constitute him the master-piece in Creation. But neither would he have been conscious of them. Whilst the loveliness of Truth and Virtue would indeed not have cheered his soul, neither would he then have become subject to their inexorable laws. He might have contentedly followed his Instincts, and being satisfied there, he would have been spared the enervating conflict ever waging between Reason and the Passions. Constituted as he is, what may he regard his highest duty and noblest aim? Shall he obey the voice of Reason? Although it matters not, since he has in any event nothing to hope or fear. Still, how may he best assuage the accusations of his conscience, which he is ever destined to experience? Is he to steel himself stolidly against these? Alas! this is for him impossible task. And how may he justify himself before the tribunal of his own understanding? To what a despicable depth must he not descend, and how hideous an object must he not render himself in our eyes, ere he is able to defy his own instincts, and walk abreast with the brute! Shall he then dedicate himself to the service of Virtue? There is verily a halo about her brow, akin to the heavenly glory. But why should he bow to the Sovereignty of Virtue even, and so forego the gratification of his strongest passions? Should man be asked to sacrifice on such an altar, in the face of the triumph of mocking vice? Should he offer up his peace, his success, his life, and, what is still more, the well-being of his offspring? And whence is he to draw the strength and heroism which such a sacrifice demands? The surrender of his highest good, and but for an empty perfection! And whence is the obligation to listen to such a challenge?

If there is no Supreme Being, the gratification of his passions is man's ideal good. He may aspire to none higher indeed. Fool, that he were, to submit to the binding obligations of Laws, which interfere with the realization of his supreme happiness, when there is no Lawmaker! What is there for him either to fear or to hope? Dying, he has reached his ultimatum. Virtue, Reason, Conscience—these are but idle words

for him, whether he lives a curse to his day and kind, or dies a martyr in behalf of some flattering chimera. Living on a level with the brute, he can only die as such, and enrich the graveyard, or become food for like creatures coming after. Such is man, with all his divine endowments, under the philosophy of Atheism.

Without, as yet, pronouncing on the merits of the Theistic creed, it is submitted without argument, that light, peace and cheer at once dawn upon man's spirit the moment the thought of a Supreme Being is harbored, and the Universe is read in its rays. What sunrise is to natural vision, such a conception—whether legitimately or illegitimately formed—is to Human Reason. At its dawn confusion swiftly gives way, as Night flees at Day-break. Intelligence, and the choicest means to high Ends emerge out of the bosom of Nature, when the halo of a Divine Fatherhood is allowed to illuminate the Universe, in virtue of which the countless agencies and their manifold functions, the revolution of inanimate spheres, and the Instincts of creatures are ordered, and the entire domain superintended after the wisest conceivable manner. Nor is man any longer such a paradox to himself, or an unmeaning riddle; he becomes a being capable of interpreting his nature, history, and destiny. The Supreme Intelligent Being, governing the Universe by airtue of His Divine Sovereignty, has assigned him to the pinnacle of Nature's pyramid—surely not to disturb His realm; endowed him with the noblest faculties—surely not to render him merely a nobler kind of animal; crowned him with Reason and the Moral Consciousness of knowing Right and Wrong, and made it irresistible—superior to his own Will—a sure proof that it was meant to be recognized by him as his highest perception, and that it is not a matter of indifference, whether he obeys the Moral Laws or not. Nor do his instincts, his comfort, or his interest any longer protest, though he is asked to perform acts of self-denial, since such sacrifices are brought as offerings on the altar of the Author of his life, whose free, wise and benevolent Will he would not disobey. He feels assured

that in submitting to His Sovereign Will he will necessarily also merit His favor—a motive sufficient for his perfect peace. He, accordingly, heeds the voice of Conscience, under the conviction, that not a single noble thought or good act can be experienced in vain. He can serenely face the temporary triumph of Vice and suffer it to vaunt itself audaciously, since it must ultimately succumb to the Right; and though Virtue may be dishonored and scandalized, he can "possess his soul in patience," and still prize it above all Wrong and Evil; neither envying nor hating the transgressor, he obeys his Conscience. If there is a Supreme Being, he feels persuaded that he is in no case the loser; he need not avenge himself, knowing that his Creator can never become his debtor; but can securely rely on this, that an Allwise and Infinitely Good Being could not have endowed him with such high prerogatives to his own injury, and will rather open another World, and regenerate him as a fit denizen for it, than suffer him to fall into the dust unhonored after a faithful service—an Instinct which Mankind has indeed cherished from a time when memory runneth not to the contrary.

Thus far we have but raised hypotheses, on the basis of the hand-writings which may be found engraved on the tablets of the Universe. Whilst under the dark lantern of Atheism they are unmeaning hieroglyphics, they become largely intelligible in the light of Theism. But as hypotheses are but guesses at Truth, at their best, and cannot be accepted as ascertained Truths or consummate facts, however much plausibility they may carry in their face, it behooves us, further, to establish the creed of Theism after the same manner in which all other moral propositions are proven—from undoubted Premises and by the inviolable Laws of Logic. Theology, the "Queen of Sciences," can only hope to retain her throne, especially in times of advancing knowledge, by rigorous criticism of her own claims, excision of the fictitious or the decayed, and the development of the new energies and adaptations needed for vigorous survival."

It is surely reasonable to assume, that some Force or Power must have antedated the genesis of the World, or the Creation of the Universe. Otherwise, mankind were compelled to believe the economy of Nature, with all its relative perfections, of having been the offspring of Zero. This were to acquiesce in the greatest of all absurdities:—*An Effect without a Cause*. The human mind has never ceased to utter its protest against such violence committed upon Reason. The famous maxim—“*Ex Nihilo, Nihil fit*”—“From Nothing, Nothing is”—is the stereotyped response of man, to such a draft on his credulity. Zero can only be conceived of as a Non-Entity—wholly bare of all the attributes of Entity, or Being—without a single accident of Real Existence; and, therefore, entirely excluded from the category of Substances. Yet, the theory which makes the Universe to be born from the womb of Zero, assumes the existence of an Unreality, as a Reality—a Non-Entity, as an Entity—a Negation, or Nothing, as a Positive Something. The qualmings of Reason, against such a patent contradiction of ideas, fully warrants its dismissal from all further consideration. The most marked system of Theism, or rankest growth of superstition, has never imposed an incubus so monstrous on human credence.

But is it absolutely required to step from Zeroism into Theism? Are there no intermediate *Stadia*, which afford as much satisfaction, or as lucid a solution to the mysterious problem of the Genesis of the Universe, as the most liberal creed of Deism furnishes to Mankind? Is it not rational to entertain the proposition, concerning an Eternal Creation? Have not the ancient sages very generally taught the theory of an Eternal Series of Cause and Effect—an Infinite Chain of Antecedents and Consequences—to which no Initial or Primary Cause is required? Does not the current process of generating Nature contribute largely towards the support of an Eternal Universe? Why may not this process have been in force from Eternity, as well as during the historic ages of Time? Why should it be considered irrational, to count backwards *ad infinitum*, when it

is allowable to count forwards *ad infinitum*? Why might it not be a series "without beginning," as well as "without end?" If the mirror of Nature—apart from Revelation—reveals no Eschatology, where does it manifest any lessons of its Genesis? What should forbid the philosopher or the scientist from receding from Effect to Cause; and from anterior Effects to more anterior Causes—on and on—say, Indefinitely? When once moving on the mystic line of Consequences and their Antecedents, at what point may the Understanding or Imagination halt, and cry:—"Eureka! I have found the *Causa Causarum*?" Is not the yclept "Primary" or "First" Cause more of a myth, than a fact—a fiction, rather than a reality? And do not all profounder thinkers abandon the arguments, once so vigorously conducted in behalf of a Supreme Being, on the line of Cause and Effect? Is it not generally admitted in this age, that this line of reasoning is an Infinite line, in whose groove it is absolutely imperative to continue, when once entered upon, since the so-called *First* Cause demands also a cause for *its own* existence, no less than all secondary Causes?

Admitting that these questions are pertinent in the lips of an Anti-Theist, and without meaning to slight their force, it is, nevertheless, fully as relevant to ask: How can a *Finite* mind entertain the conception of an *Infinite* series? Is a being of limited and conditioned capacities, capable of conceiving of an Unlimited, Unconditioned, and Absolute Order of Antecedents and Consequences? To continue in antedating, from eon to eon—through Time, and into the cycles of Eternity even—is but a fruitless postponement, rather than a measure of relief. This is readily appreciated, if we confine our search to one's family lineage. Every individual sire is but the son of 'an earlier sire; and this sire, of a still anterior sire. Of what avail is it, then, to move more remotely back, since, sooner or later, we must halt at a Proto-Sire, if we are to obtain any satisfactory results? In like manner, man is forced, in consequence of the finite order of mind, either to endorse the absurd-

ity of deducing the Universe from Zero, or to admit a Progenitor, of some nature, of all things.

And it is not to be gainsayed, either, that the existing order of Nature may be conceived of as generating, on and on, to Infinity. Such a general evolution is by no means irrational or absurd. But this is only so, because mankind is cognizant of the *existing working order of Nature*, at hand and under his eye. These actual Causes are the premises from which a continuation may be argued. But man may still not, as well, argue a Post Infinity, though he is permitted to imagine a Future Infinity, for the forcible reason, that he cannot count *back* of Unity, in the same manner as he counts *forward* of Unity. Mathematicians do, indeed, indulge in such numerical fictions; but the mystic domain, opening up on the left side of Unity, is but a mirroring territory, at best, in which men may pursue the chase endlessly on, without ever seizing upon the ever-eluding prize, notwithstanding. Whilst it may seem logical to hold to the theory of the Eternity of matter, or of a Material Universe, its untenableness becomes apparent, through the fact, that a being of relative or finite capacities cannot intelligently postulate an Infinite Series, nor conceive of any progression back of Unity. Thus, a plausible sentiment must succumb before proven logical truth.

As long as men persist in portraying the Progenitor of the Universe as a "First" Cause that differs only from Secondary Causes in that it is Primary, or Initial, it is difficult to refute the theory of an Eternal Universe. It is only when a Supreme Being is conceived of as an *Independent* and *Self-Existent* Being, that the spell which the enchanting line of Cause and Effect exerts on the mind is broken. Unless, therefore, an Independent and Self-Existent Being is assumed, one of the two already noted contradictions must follow:—

a) Either the Universe emanated from Zero: Something from Nothing;

b) Or an Infinite Series of Antecedents and Consequences must be: An Eternal Universe.

It must be conceded, likewise, that man is wholly unequal to the task of realizing in himself the *Nature* of an Independent Self-Existent Being. Whilst it is possible to form a conception, its interpretation is wholly beyond man in Time, and it may even remain above man in Eternity. Yet this impossibility exists by no means, because an Independent Self-Existent Eternal is not possible; but because of man's limited and finite order of mind. Nor is this confession a mere evasion of the difficulty, or a handy subterfuge by any means. Several parallels will aid us in our present order of reasoning:—

Man is confessedly incompetent to define the *Essence* of even finite creatures. Still less, then, could he be asked intelligently to interpret the Essence of the Infinite Being. The phenomena of Endless Duration and Boundless Space, besides, are likewise beyond the reach of men's conceptions. Yet Infinite Duration as well as Infinite Space he is wholly unable to annihilate or deny. But how would the Ideas of such confounding phenomena ever come to enter the human mind as necessary Ideas, apart from their actual existence? It were as absurd to regard them as mere fictions, as it were irrational and contradictory to maintain an Absent Present; a Shadow without Substance; or an actuality, apart from reality. In like manner, it is still reasonable to cherish the conception of an Independent, Self-Existent, Eternal Being, whose Nature is yet unintelligible. And such a Being is one of the necessary Truths, which the human mind imperatively challenges in order to its success in the attainment of certitude in any direction whatsoever. It is known that the ancient Sages generally taught the Eternity of Nature. But they did not on this account deny a Great First Cause. Their ideas of primeval matter were confused; and this confusion accounts also for the vagueness which tinged their choicest conceptions of a Supreme Being, as well as for their departures from the trail of Truth they often struck, into by-paths, lest they might lose themselves in the maze, should they follow it too far. All however, who taught with any force and clearness—Anaxagoras, Timæus, Socrates, Plato, and Aris-

tote—maintained the necessary pre-existence of a Primary, Incorporeal, Unchangeable, Intelligent Being, through Whom the original Motion and Order of the Universe were effected, as otherwise, Motion must be held without a Motor, or as emanations from Zero—conceptions which are alike contradictory. Aristotle claims to stand foremost among those who clearly established the Eternity of the Material Universe. But in his mind, the Eternity of Nature is but an Eternal Effect of an infinitely Efficient Intelligence and Power, which is rather a play with words, than an original thought, and a mode of expression which may still mislead those who conceive it possible to hold to an Eternal Genesis of Nature, and thereby tempt such to surrender all correct ideas of the Deity, as well as to regard Matter as a Divine Emanation—a theory which a majority of Pagan Philosophers upheld, in the dim light of their age, and according to which but little progress can be gained in the search after Truth. But if the Deity is held to be Eternal in His Nature, it follows also, that He must have been Eternally Omnipotent likewise, as well as Eternally efficient and active. Yet, as it is not conceivable, that even an Omnipotent Being may declare that to have no Beginning, which, nevertheless, in the nature of things must have had a Beginning; or, that a continuous series of Numbers should yet not have Unity as a starting-point, so too were it equally inconceivable that an indefinite progression of Effects, each and all in which must have their several antecedents, should not likewise have an antecedent as a whole. Else it would follow too, that Omnipotence can declare the Infinite finite, or the finite Infinite.

It must, furthermore, be acknowledged, that the mind of man cannot realize a Genesis of Nature any more than he can realize its Boundaries, without bewildering himself amid the Eons of Time or the regions in Space. And yet, in conceiving of Nature as neither self-originated or self-existent, as neither Eternal nor Infinite, he may antedate its Genesis as far back along the course of Time as he pleases, he must inevitably reach an Epoch in thought, when its history must have been but

half its present age; when it had reached only the one-thousandth part of its duration: and when it must have had its Beginning, too. Otherwise, an Eternal Universe, in its literal sense, would imply a countless series of Numbers without unity—an Infinite totality of finite constituents.

Even Ocellus ("The Nature of the Universe," 480 B. C.) does not dispute this conclusion. As far as the Galmathian metaphysician is at all intelligible, his readers can learn that he distinguishes between the Form and Essence of the Universe, and combines these through an efficient Power—after the style of the Pythagorean School;—but in a manner so dark and mysterious, as rightly to deserve to be ranked by his more thoughtful disciples, among that class of sages, who, whilst they prove themselves abundantly able to distinguish between the Supreme Being and the Universe, were not competent to exalt Him to His lofty station in their systems of thought. A closer study of this author's metaphysical works, nevertheless, furnishes authentic proof of the tardy progress by which the present stage of Philosophy was attained, and of the many centuries of severe struggle, during which those Truths were doomed to lie dormant, which seem to those who live under brighter skies to constitute but the Alphabet of human science. Anaxagoras stands among the first of thinkers, who contribute largely towards the humiliation of a vain Philosophy, in that he proved himself, before all others, able to clearly distinguish between an Eternal Intelligent Being, and Matter, as well as, to set forth in brilliant colors the economy and order of Nature. And yet a Socrates laments sadly over his efforts, and confesses that he had succeeded more in exciting his own anxiety to know the Creator, than to satisfy his soul concerning Him.

The lamentation of Socrates might well suggest to the mind of the Theist the pressing importance of carefully reviewing the ground on which his creed rests. And in order that a more ready, fresh, and personal answer may prove at hand to the question: *Why am I a Theist?*—a further investigation may be prosecuted.

From what has been said, thus far, the proposition may be accepted as ground common between the Theist and Atheist. *Videlicet*: THAT SOME FORCE OR POWER MUST HAVE PRE-EXISTED, OR ANTEDATED THE UNIVERSE.

But the Pre-existence of a Force or Power of some order or kind, were not yet sufficient for man's intelligence and peace. A threefold question suggests itself to our consideration, in the immediate wake of the conclusion arrived at:—

a.) May not Matter itself be the Pre-existent Force or Power?

b.) Is the Pre-existent Force or Power an Unconscious Essence?

c.) Is the Pre-existent Essence a Personal God?

And unless the last of the Trio can be affirmatively established, our investigation has conducted us but a short remove from blank Atheism itself.

It behooves us, first of all, to inquire whether MATTER itself is not perhaps the womb out of which the Universe was born? By Matter we understand an inanimate substance. The defenders of the "*Kraft-und-Stuff*" school embrace so much under this term. If then Matter was the pre-existent, Eternal, and self-existent substance, by which Nature was conceived and brought forth, with all its relative perfection and order, it must necessarily have contained within its crevices and folds all the forces and powers which the Universe contains and exhibits; though it is itself wholly inanimate, unconscious, and dead. But as the Nature of the Supreme Being embraces all possible perfections, it follows, that Life, Intelligence, and Freedom—attributes which can in no imaginable way co-exist in such a substance—are not the offspring of Matter, and, therefore, not to be sought for in its loins.

The untenableness of the theory becomes more manifest still in connection with man himself. He were then also a product of an unconscious and dead substance, conscious, intelligent, and moral being as he is. But whence did he derive his personal prerogatives? May we regard these as the cream of

Matter, which rose by some means to its surface, and became in some strange way independent of it? Or are these after all, perhaps, essential ingredients of the primeval substance? If the fundamental constituents of man's nature are the excrescence of an inanimate, unconscious substance, it is manifestly inconceivable and impossible, that these should sublimate themselves into such higher and totally different perfections as the constitution of man contains. It may be mooted that his extraordinary qualities are the out-come of *Syntheses*, or happy juxtapositions of atoms, particles and parts. But then consciousness may be compared to an order of Statics, and Reason to an order of Dynamics—Rest and Motion. Bayle is severely accurate, accordingly, in maintaining, that one state of combinations represents a straight line; another, a sensation of pleasure; a third, a mathematical conception; a fourth, an idea of moral conduct, which somehow is associated with the love or fear of a Supreme Being, since it is contended that from Rest and Motion nothing beyond Rest and Motion may be predicated; even as sound and color, apart from sensation and perception ever remain in their native category.

Whence emanated original motion to a mass which lay eternally dead? Whence came the primary impulse? When, for example, the mass, composing the Solar System, lay closely folded in death-like stillness at its great centre, what imaginable Force may we imagine to have differentiated the gigantic bulk into different Bodies, Suns and Spheres, and projected them over the boundless regions of Space, after such an exact order, as that their several centres of gravity should so happily correspond with each other, as well as with the entirety of Nature? Lord Buffon's Comet were hardly sufficient, since we must first account for the Comet itself, and after that, for its own motion—awkwardly as it zig-zagged its course along.

We are once more obliged to assume Zero as the primary, efficient cause of Nature, or to confess that Motion is an inherent and essential characteristic of Matter; against both of which Reason ceases not to utter its veto.

It were, besides, hard to conceive of Matter being at rest in any imaginable quarter of the Universe, were Motion an immanent Force of itself. And even granting, that the average measure of external and internal movement produces an equilibrium, how are the various directions, or lines of movement on so vast a scale, to be accounted for? For the universal harmony, among the countless species, which are supposed to be formed from the same mass, and yet constitute but one organic whole? The Sun's distance; the revolutions of the Earth; its locality and density; the proportion of Fire and Water; the measure subsisting between Vegetables and Animals:—all these are accurately scaled and poised, each to each, and all to all, and without an iron-clad Fate, dwell in perfect peace!

A leisure walk in the field opens the door to a wondrous theater of variety and accord at once. From the sponge to the giant oak, there are many intermediate grades. Here are annuals, biennials, and centennials. Some multiply singly, others, thirty, sixty, an hundred, and a thousand fold. Yet each observes its own harvest season—a striking evidence of some wise ordering. Were there a simultaneous ripening, or a like proportion of reproduction in all Plants, a fearful waste must occur. Were all Vegetation but herbs, or shrubs, or even trees, there must be a prodigal poverty still. Myriads of creatures were deprived of sustenance and shelter, were there a monotonous uniform scale laid down. For the supplying of all creature-wants a terrestrial surface were necessary, magnified a hundred times from its present dimensions in vain, and wholly worthless for mankind to boot.

In the Animal Kingdom the same manifoldness and correspondence is to be discerned. Every creature multiplies in the ratio of its usefulness and provision made for its survival. Fishes and Insects reproduce in shoals and swarms; whilst Whales bear twins. The Ephemera are provided with wings already in their embryo state, that they may swiftly migrate from their habitats. Among land animals the same corres-

pondence is observed. The useful herds subsist on luxuriant meadows and grassy plains, whilst a majority, which seem to exist but for replenishing the Earth, live off each other. But from the ant to the lion, we find their strength, instincts, and ratios of productions so exactly measured between beasts of prey and their victims, that an equilibrium is ever maintained. Though all exist and maintain themselves after a like manner, yet is there a marvellous relation preserved between individual kinds, and their peculiar mode of sustenance, as well as their native element.

Their general bodily symmetry strikes man with great force. The size, form, and instinct, of birds are adapted to the air, whilst those of fishes are made for the deep. All are constituted for their own latitudes; their limbs and organs have their special functions; and they, in sum, constitute a complete, perfect, and organic Body. Let but a single joint be changed to a hair's breath, and we have a helpless abortion, or a monster. And precisely where Mechanism ceases, Instinct begins. All know their food; their mates; their foes; their aggressive and defensive weapons; their measure of strength; when to stand; when to flee, or when to resort to stratagem. Some live through a single Summer; others die for the Winter only. These store their year's support with most economic foresight; those migrate with a geographical knowledge which baffles the most experienced navigator. The subtle power of Instinct is shared by the tiniest insect, with the giants of the forest and the sea, since it is equally necessary to each one's preservation; yet is the measure of it so regulated by an incomprehensible wisdom and beneficence, beginning with the simplest order of Sensation, mounting with increasing proportions, through countless steps, towards the most refined and delicate grades of Perception; never halting, until the confines of pure Intelligence are reached. All along the climax, the measure is in proportion to the relative perfection of the creature, invariably. The dog and the horse were useless animals, elevated as these are beyond many others, did they not possess precisely that measure of docility

and memory, which is theirs, or did their allotment approximate in the least degree nearer to intelligence, they were at once the most unfortunate of brutes.

Man himself stands within the circle of harmonious relations. His form, senses and capacities, all are metered after the magnificent scale of the Universe, of which he forms so noble a part. His sight, hearing, his general compass of sensibilities, might have been infinitely duller, as well as infinitely keener; but were only a slight change made in his construction, the Universe were no longer the same for him. He might still abide in it, but its harmony would be gone for him.

If, still further, man's Perception and Reason were but the result of a happy synthesis, or series of syntheses, he might then conceive of as many more mental functions as he could imagine kinds of such factitious juxta-positions. Verily one must regard it as a most methodical chance, by which his present prerogatives already should have come to him!

Suppose man to be gifted with a Judgment of the highest order, yet lacked the faculty of Memory; with the most vivid Imagination but unable to Reason; with the various functions of mind, without their proper correlations—such correspondences, *e. g.*, were wanting, as the normal connection between Sensation and Perception; the right proportion between the Voluntary and Involuntary movement of his body; or, that the impressions of his senses were to continue equally and indelibly vivid; or were free from the control of his understanding; or, that his Perception and Reason, superinduced by his Sensations, were not in balance; or, that his Nerves did but lose their sensibilities; or, that his whole Nervous System experienced all sensations throughout itself; or, that he had not his present form, his normal limbs; or, he were unable to walk erect; or, were deprived of his fingers, his understanding still remaining; or, that mankind were not of an average uniform stature; or, were not gifted with similar strength, sensations, passions, or principles of knowledge and feelings of happiness:—all human sodality, association and fellowship, were at an end forever; and with all

his prerogatives, he would still be a most unfortunate and miserable creature.

In such harmonious relations we find man and all other creatures to stand to Nature's totality. But as little as any separate tint on the artist's palette determines the combination of all tints, or as little as all the colors combined determine the style of the portrait, so little too, may we hope to find the agency of the wise and beneficent economy in Nature's own bosom, or in any secret chamber of its vast and royal domain. In its analysis, nothing can be properly said to exist for itself, or to be "its own excuse for being." Every department is wholly unconscious of its being at all, or of its neighbor realm; still less, may it determine their existence. Plants do not order the being or nature of Animals. The individual limbs and muscles, in the physical structure, do not create each other or assign their functions. All are but forces in the grand whole. Let any one be altered in the least degree, and death, chaos, and a desert of disorder results. Only in consequence of their relationship, each to each, and all, is there harmony and perfection—a Kingdom. But it is a Kingdom which may be likened to a well-regulated household, under whose roof-tree the most scrupulous care is had for all its inmates, for their comfort and happiness, lest want befall them; where provision is made against emergencies even; and where nothing runs to waste. Just such a Law by the most prudent economy reigns throughout this empire of manifoldness. There is no want; all things exist with reference to higher ends and purposes; nothing is meaningless, or exclusively for itself; all are bound to serve their neighbors, for the well-being of others, and that of the whole. And, finally, all subserve Mankind.

Nor does the reign of Law and Order cease in Death; even the flowers in the field, the smallest ephemera, all contribute their share of glory to their Maker, to His Omniscience and Omnipotence, during their brief stay, by means of their beauty and relative completeness; and when their end is reached, they die. But lo! there are at hand at once myriads of other crea-

tures, ready to appropriate their "remains" to their own subsistence, to the purification of the Air and Earth; or, to dissolve all again into primal matter, relegating it back to the laboratory of Nature, to form new creatures in the room of the dead.

If there is no Higher Governing Spirit, independent of Matter itself, by whose hand this wise economy was established and conceived, the strain to which Reason is subjected, in being obliged to account for such a Universe, on the ground of a blind chance, an unconscious Chemistry, or dead Mechanics, is greater than the rankest and maddest Superstition has ever imposed upon mankind. The theory of "Various Centres," followed by a subsequent ingenious "Carpentering" and dove-tailing of all into one universal structure, is wholly untenable. Without a Sun, it is impossible to conceive of a fertile Earth; without the Earth, there is no need of a Moon; without an Atmosphere, no Vegetation; without Vegetables, no Animals. The Universe is the result of a Plan, which implied the *simultaneous* birth and maturing of each and all parts of it, and the marshalling of all its hosts, at one and the same time, into their destined niches, grooves, cycles, and relative positions.

With all the gravity of a Carthusian monk, the materialist offers us his *Crambe vis repetita* after such a ritual:—"The vast Phenomenon of Nature, in all its breadth, and height and depth, from the grain of sand to the central Sun—even the Synthesis of atoms and organs of the wisest of sages not excepted, is but a factitious insensate series of happy combinations—a long linked chain into which the eternal particles of a boiling Chaos have annealed and adjusted themselves. The primal matter of all existing things—Fire, Water, Air, and Earth—is eternal in its nature; and, though ever inanimate and unconscious, it is yet of a necessarily existing kind. The original "*Ur Schlamm*" was set in motion, far back in the eons of Eternity, by no manifest efficient causes, either within or without itself. Particles of Light and Heat embraced each other, and myriads of suns were born. Coarser bulks combined after their own blind way, and formed themselves into Celestial and

Terrestrial Bodies, dark and opaque. The commingling of Sunshine, Water, and Earth, produced a spontaneous Fermentation. Hence are the countless Syntheses, in virtue of irresistible Forces, called Laws. The sum of all these juxta-positions gives us the kingdom of Nature, which mankind so superstitiously worship as the handiwork of a God. Naturally, a still larger portion of Matter remained uniform and still stuff. Some chunks generated themselves into the syntheses of Plants, with the tact of Reproduction; whilst yet other masses acquired the mystic Principle of Life, and organized themselves into Animals. The subtle spark, once ignited, the step between the glow-worm to the elephant, or from the ant to the walrus, was merely a question of several eons or eternities. The constitutions of the various creatures; their forms, powers, and capacities; Sensations, Perceptions, Instincts, Intelligences, Reason, and Will:—these are but 'Differentiations'—results of a chance-like process, conditioned only by their mutual action and reaction—of Being and Environments—and the 'Survival of the Fittest.'"

But why has this marvellous process of *Fermentation* ceased? How came it that Mother-Nature lost Her fecundating organ, somewhere along Her wearisome travels through the infinite series of eons? Why do no longer any new species surprise us? Why must all creatures now come upon the stage through the narrow and exclusive gate-way of propagation? By what stroke of paralysis was the generating *nisus* of Fermentation made barren? And made barren too, just at that epoch of Nature's eternal course, when and where the symmetry of every individual being—or the fitness of all things—as well as when and where the harmony of the grand totality suggested it? By what instinctive Force were the superfluous atoms, scattered all through the vast boiling caldron, held in check, and only the fit ones conveyed to hand? What plastic fingers formed, arranged and moulded the wondrously exact scale of gradations, which embraces all species and orders of the seething, yet dead mass of matter? How might the ocean of restless slime become

the womb of the Sexes, and cast up a pair of singularly alike and yet as singularly different beings—differing the one from the other, only so far as the mysterious act of propagation demands, but alike and uniform in duration, locality, and all other respects? How came the disorderly and anarchical mass to have fruited in Law and Order? Whence came the law of vision, which so combines the different humors, cuticles and fibres, which form the eye, or any one of the delicate organs of the human or animal body? How was the eye correlated with light, the ear to sound? How arose the force which builds the sinews, muscles, bones and coverings, which enter into that master-piece—Man's Physique? How came the nicely selecting force, which adapts all parts to the whole, and the whole to its own element and latitude; choosing special eyes for the birds and beasts which roam at night, and just as special, but antipodal organs of sight, for such as fly or run by day; others as marvellously well fitted, and as unique too, for the finny tribes; one kind of teeth for the granivorous, another for the carnivorous? Whence are the attracting and repelling laws—centripetal and centrifugal—which builds structures so carefully as never to make a mistake; never allotting the eye of a fish to an eagle, or the hoof of a horse to the leg of a lion; placing every organ and member in right relation; omitting nothing, and duplicating nothing; forming a body that lives, grows, feels, and reproduces itself, every one after its kind, and graduating all into a symmetrical realm; observing a strict uniformity amid a host of varieties; causing a right and left side to every being; a head, neck, and central spinal column; meting a normal proportion of limbs for its preservation, its means of sensation; changing them only so far as the preservation and well-being demands; furnishing to all a hard skin for the soles of their feet—ere they are born too—assigning to the human species an oblong foot, that man may walk erect; a clavicle to his arms—which is denied to all other creatures; and, on the other hand, withholding from him those natural weapons of warfare, the advantages of a keen sight and smell, which are in-

dispensable to lower animals, but which were superfluous in man, because he is supplied with Reason and hands.

It is held, and with much truth, that all species of Creation are prototyped in their embryos, and become actualized through the process of development, or according to modern phraseology, Evolution. Without entering into the merits of the theory, it may be said, nevertheless, that by adopting it, the miracle of wisdom is enhanced a thousandfold. We are forced to inquire then, where the germ of the last grown seed lay during all the cycles of ages? And where originated the antetype of the primal seed? If human imagination may venture so far, it might, still further, be asked, by what mysterious Power were the myriads of germs, which have developed since the Genesis of Creation, and shall continue to multiply until its end, involved in each other, and ultimately, in the primary germ? And how came their sum total to be so proportionately calculated, as that every species sustains its corresponding ratio?

However current the thought has become, that Mother-Nature has been the Niobe or the Rachel, for many long periods, "weeping for her children because they are not;" having brought forth but malformations—unfortunates—abortions—monsters—all of which, like the fabled Saturn, she fell upon to devour, that they might be brought forth again, but, alas! only to be again devoured, until, at last, by the law of survival and selection, she was so blessed as to behold a Model Pair of the long line of abortive ancestry, which she chose as the Proto-Parents of the Human Race; and notwithstanding the eclat that surrounds the theory of Evolution;—one risks nothing in calling it 'speculation run mad.' If it is pure satire to say that "a mountain laboring brought forth a mouse," what is it, to teach, that "a mouse laboring brought forth a mountain?" Surely matter excelled itself in its genesis of creatures far nobler than itself—Plants, Animals, and Man!

And why are there not still such failures of Nature—creatures with superfluous feet along the back, let us ask; or, with redundant eyes in the back of their heads? Yea, still better,

why might not Nature yet longer try its hand and produce new and nobler departures, seeing that such good success crowned her long and tedious struggles, along the course of the ages, in the cheering hope of bringing upon the Earth a Race more noble even than mankind?

And to assume a process of gradual Aggregation, through a Law of Assimilation and Elimination, as in the case of minerals and crystals—*i. e.*, through a "Survival of the Fittest"—brings no light and cheer either. We meet with no creature having a head, yet no heart; with a heart, but no arteries, and veins; or able to move though without muscles; sensitive, apart from a Nervous System; capable of growth, yet lacking all nourishing organs. An occasional specimen, of such rejections, we think, might still be found washed out, and strewn along the shore. Lord Lionnet enumerates several thousand visible fibres, nerves, and veins in a caterpillar—all these signs of the very "fittest" in a worm, which seems yet the *unfittest* in the catalogue of creature-life!

And, finally, from what secret chamber of Nature's vast work-shop could the Mechanics of the Universe, by which the proper proportions and relations of all its Creatures, in every department, are fixed and conserved with mathematical precision towards all and the whole? By which the ratio between Births and Deaths remain correct and unalterable? The variation of the sexes is upheld? And by which the survival of Law continues in the face of untold revolutions, dissolutions and destructions, so that all the departments remain uninvaded; that no species is eliminated, that no order is wrenched out of its line, groove or joint; and by which all spheres and their members, from the minutest atom to the royal sun, form a chain—a complete and perfect chain?

Without argument, now, let the question be submitted:—Is it, or is it not, more natural for a thinking man, after but such a hasty review of the Universe, to accept the existence of a Creator, than to trace it back to blind Chance—to an iron Fate, or to Zero?

But may we not escape all perplexities and contradictions, by supposing the Universe itself, with its contents to be the Eternal Self-existent Being, and so adopt one of the multitudinous forms of Pantheism?

At a casual glance this ancient theory carries much plausibility in its face. Since we are compelled, under any view, to assume a necessarily Self-existent and Eternal Being, why not, then, believe the Universe to be this Being, rather than postulate an Eternal Independent One, outside of it? Have we not at once at hand, in this view, the ground and source, whence the whole Empire of order and perfection sprang, which fills us with such wonder and amazement? All is a Unit, then—One Eternal Substance; whilst every variety of creature-life, the inanimate and animate, with all their immanent forces and powers, are but so many inevitable modifications of the One Eternal Substance.

It behooves us, first of all, though, to ask; What evidence is there, to convince man, that all the various and antagonistic objects, such as the Sun and the Sea, Minerals and Men, are but so many varieties of one and the same Substance? Were it any more irrational, to hold all the accidents of the Square, and the Curved Line of the Snail, to be but so many departures from one, infinite Straight Line? And on the absurd assumption too, that none but such an endless straight line can possibly embrace all such variations? This is to beg the whole question, and to take for granted, what must first be established. And if it be assumed, for argument's sake, the proposition, nevertheless, remains, that this necessarily Self-existent Substance cannot, at the same time be, and not be. If, therefore, the Universe, with all its contents, contains in its own womb this Eternal, Independent Being, it follows, that all creatures, in all their number and kind—every single worm—are essential parts of the Supreme Substance; and, that these are all so substantially and inevitably one with this Being, that we are as little capable of conceiving of Him apart from the creatures themselves, as we are able to believe that this Being

is to be finite and temporal. This were the height of absurdity, however. As soon as we assume such a Being, who must be of a necessary self-existent nature, we cannot any longer separate the attributes of Eternity and Infinity from Him, even for a moment—no more than we can ignore space and time. But we are competent to conceive of one Planet less, or even, of annihilating the whole Solar System; and this, too, without destroying the *idea* of the Universe in the least degree. In this light we are enabled to discern the difference between Absolute Being, on the one side, and Relative Existence, on the other—between the Necessary and the Possible.

Is it reasonable, then, to identify any one portion of mere possible and relative creature-life, with the Absolute and Necessarily Self-existent Life of a Supreme Being? Surely, that which we may conceive of as not being, or as not necessarily existing, cannot be one with an order of Being which cannot be conceived of as not being.

The absurdity is not yet fully apparent, however. A Being, which by virtue of its Nature must inevitably be of an Absolute order of Being, cannot be otherwise than what and as it is. It is, therefore, impossible for a single creature to be different from its actual and real nature; or, that it should move in any other direction and manner than it does. Hence, it must also follow, from the Nature and Constitution of the Pantheist's Supreme Being, that Planets must revolve from West to East; that Comets are obliged to fly across the celestial domains; and, that mal-formed creatures and abortions even, are no departures from Nature's canons; since it were absolutely inconceivable for all these to be different from what they are—being parts of the Substance of the Supreme Being, who is of a necessary and absolute order of Being.

But can any greater licentiousness be indulged. True as it is, that all things move in perfect harmony; that the distance between the Earth and Sun, or the interval is best adapted to the myriads of terrestrial creatures; that the hosts of insects and animals are wisely correlated in their orders and destinies;

and that their several natures and constituent proportions are marvellously adapted to their native elements and modes of subsistence; but that, for example, the "Angle of 66'," which the Earth forms with the Equator, must be an emanation from the Eternal and Absolute Being, and that it must be held as wholly irrational and as an absurd impossibility, for it to be in the least degree different from what it actually is—this were the essence of improbability.

And this is not all. If the Universe, with its vast realms of creatures and objects, is the Eternal and Supreme Being, and all the changes and transformations, which are ever transpiring on so large a scale, are but modifications and fatalities of such an Only and Supreme Essence, it must be, likewise, that all men also constitute essential parts of the Deity; and that all shades of human conduct are but modifications and emanations of Him. Then a *Haller* is not essentially superior to a *La Maternia*; or a *Fenelon* to a *Malagrida*. Wisdom and Mania; Virtue and Vice; these are different only in name. Error, Malice and Blasphemy—a conclusion from which a *Spinoza* shrinks!—all are but variations of the One Supreme Essence, which are alike absolute and inevitable generations. And since these are contained in the Supreme Essence, they must also constitute its highest conceivable excellence, for the sole reason, that they exist at all. All men and things; the burglar and his judge; the executioner and the guillotine; all are like constituents of the Deity.

Finally, if the Universe, with all that it contains, constitutes the Eternal, Absolute Supreme Being, it follows again, that nothing is really possible of existing at all, beyond that which actually is; as well as that it is inconceivable for such an Essence to be capable of producing anything of His own free will. For such an order of Being there is no free action or power; no more than a stone possesses in falling to the Earth, which cannot descend after any other imaginable way than it does. Nor can we predicate any pure Intelligence of Self-consciousness of such a Deity. Consequently, we have an unconscious

and dead Being, of whose Nature such attributes as Life, Consciousness and Freedom cannot be thought of, without falling into a blank contradiction. Such a Being is wholly unconscious of its own existence and power—unless we would deal in words without meaning. Whilst in man, who is a part of this Being, we may witness Life, yet at his household board, at which he breaks his bread, or in the walls which enclose him, it is but dead matter. It may exhibit thought in the human soul; and at the same hour, in a thousand other souls; yet in all the thoughts is different, not one being conscious of such variety of modifications either; yea, it may exist under wholly contradictory forms of conceptions even. In this moment may be harbored the idea of the impossibility of Self-consciousness; whilst in a *Spinoza* the flattering sense of being able to fully realize it, may exist in flowering luxuriance. In a *Newton* again, it may assume the grand form of Pure Reason; in a *Werthhof* it may mold itself in an amiable Passion; in a *Candide*, it degenerates in the horrible apparition of Blasphemy; and in a *Maniac*, it is mad Raving.

It is difficult to believe, that men should still continue to harbor such absurdities, at the evening of the XIXth Century.

VI.

NATURAL SCIENCE AS A POST-GRADUATE STUDY.

BY S. H. GUILFORD, A.M., D.D.S.*

AMONG the ties that bind men together, none perhaps are stronger than those of college life. Thrown together as members of one great family, at a time when the affections are ever pure and fresh, friendships and associations are formed that last through life. To renew and strengthen these and to testify to our continued interest in the institution so dear to us, we, as Alumni, gather each year within the old halls.

Pleasant as these occasions ever are, our pleasure to-day is tempered with sorrow at the absence of one whose kindly presence in former years lent dignity and grace to our annual gathering. Intimately associated with our Institution from its organization, twice its honored President, covering a period of nearly half its existence, and ever manifesting the deepest interest in its welfare, we had come to look upon him as its natural head and to revere him as a father.

To each one of us his death will prove a personal loss, and in recalling his many virtues and exalted character, his busy life and its unselfish ends, may we be stimulated and encouraged by the noble example he has set us.

The far-reaching results of his great and good work no man can measure, but they will live after him and bear fruit while time shall last. Of such men the world sees not many; let heaven be praised for the few.

As college graduates we cannot but have noticed, among the

* Annual address delivered before the Alumni Association of Franklin and Marshall college. June 16, 1886.

various plans proposed for the betterment of the college curriculum, the radical measures advocated by some in recent years.

The most startling demand made by these would-be reformers was that the study of the dead languages, especially Greek, should be eliminated from the course and the place supplied by substitution of the modern foreign languages or natural sciences; or, if the former were not eliminated, they wished the study of them to be made optional.

Like all new ideas or innovations, whether of value or not, this new method caught the fancy of many and it was not long before a number of colleges, abroad and at home, adopted the new idea and changed their courses to correspond to the proposed plan of reform. Naturally, some institutions vied with each other in their readiness to adopt, and the length to which they should carry, this new idea.

Of the two older and more widely known of our American colleges, Harvard and Yale, the former seems to have entirely broken with the past, while the latter clings to her old methods, seeing no reason for change and believing that this new idea will be as short-lived as it was readily adopted.

At a recent gathering of Yale Alumni in New York City, the modern idea was discussed and the question arose as to whether old Yale, then about to elect a new President, should make some change in her curriculum to suit the ideas of the modern so-called Progressives or continue in her old and well-tried course. With singular and perhaps surprising unanimity, these Alumni, having only the best interests of education in general and the true welfare of their Alma Mater at heart, decided that in their opinion no radical change in the old methods ought to be made.

Such, we believe, would be the almost unanimous verdict, if it were asked, of the Alumni who have gone out from this Institution; for if they rejoice in one thing more than another in connection with the conduct of old Franklin and Marshall, it is that, in the midst of all the turmoil of modern educational revolution, she has had the courage and wisdom to hold to her old

moorings rather than cast about in unknown seas for a new harbor.

Two erroneous ideas in reference to collegiate education have prevailed in the past: one, that the true function of a college was to satisfy a young man with knowledge; the other, that college training was especially and almost exclusively valuable in fitting young men for the learned professions.

The former and older of these illusions is happily dispelled, and it has come to be very generally understood that college study and training are not intended to secure to the student a mass of knowledge, but rather to bring out and develop that which is already in him. It cannot create a new faculty, or develop one that is not already there, but it does aim and should succeed in making the most of those powers with which the individual has been endowed.

It is a training-school, *per se*, and only pretends to prepare for the ready and systematic acquirement of knowledge after the training has been completed.

The latter and more modern fallacy, that a college course is useful as fitting for a professional career, but not for any other, is, we think, quite refuted by the facts. The greater number of colleges springing up all over the land, with their yearly increasing lists of students; the greater number of these students who are fitting themselves for vocations other than the learned professions; the testimony of college-bred men in mercantile and general business life; and the constantly-expressed regret on the part of those who have been denied the privilege of a college course, all bear witness to its value.

While believing that a collegiate course is of undoubted benefit to all who can avail themselves of it, it were foolish, in the face of every-day observations, to contend that its possession would of itself remove the difficulties of life and lead to success in any department.

Success in any vocation is dependent upon a variety of qualifications and conditions, and if these be not present in the individual, the possession of a college degree will not save him

from failure ; neither will the absence of the degree prevent his success if they be present.

Many college-bred men fail to attain success in life, while many who have never enjoyed college advantages have met with conspicuous success. The superficial observer, noticing this fact only, draws from it the conclusion that college training, while a very pretty ornament, is really valueless as a help to success in life.

To a more careful observer, however, the non-success of the collegian in certain cases would argue either the non-use or misuse of valuable advantages an unfortunate choice of avocation ; or lack of fixedness of purpose and determination. Abstractly, it would be hard to find an individual who would contend that education could be a hindrance to man in any sphere of life, or that a well-trained mind did not possess a value wherever placed ; and if this be so, we cannot understand why a college graduate should not possess inherent advantages over his less fortunate fellows. That he should not excel him, in certain instances, argues only that he, with greater advantages, has permitted himself to be outdone by one to whom those advantages have been denied.

The true value of mental training and discipline, as accomplished by a judicious college course, is perhaps to no one more apparent than to him whose province it is to train young men for professional or other life-work. Those who have had the advantage of collegiate instruction are readily distinguishable from those who have not. The power of the former to readily grasp presented truth and easily retain it ; their ready reference of effect back to cause ; the systematic arrangement of apprehended facts so as to be at all times readily available ; and the ease and comfort with which all their mental effort is put forth, makes them at once conspicuous among their less fortunate associates.

It is not, however, to argue the advisability or general applicability of a college course that we have come here to-night, but to urge upon you the claims of Natural Science as a post-graduate study.

If the college curriculum has for its main object the general development of the intellectual and moral faculties in order to properly fit us for the greatest usefulness in life, should this training cease with the close of our college career, or should it be continued and extended throughout our whole lives? Ought we to regard the diploma as a certificate of exemption from further mental effort, except such as may be necessary to gain us a livelihood and increase our material possessions, or should we view it rather as a passport to the vast outlying regions of knowledge to which we have not yet had access?

There is an idea, too generally prevalent, that the mental training of young men is primarily, if not exclusively, useful in fitting them for some particular vocation, to which they should devote their entire attention in order that it may bring them some honor and a large moneyed return. They seem to lose sight of the fact that each man owes a duty to himself, his neighbor and the world at large which cannot fully be paid while keeping within the narrow confines of his daily vocational work.

Post-graduate culture is not alone a duty imposed upon us by the liberal training we have received, intended to fit us for more than the ordinary pursuit of a vocation, nor yet alone for the extent of usefulness to mankind in general for which it has prepared us, though this should be its highest aim and end; but we may recognize in it, if we will, one of the greatest and most lasting pleasures of life—a joy not only to the individual himself, but one capable of impartment to all with whom he may come in contact.

Beside all this there is linked with the pursuit of it the element of physical well-being, by no means one of the meanest of arguments in its behalf. Instances of the broken-down business man, worn out with its worrying cares, or of the professional man wrecked in health by ceaseless devotion to his calling are far from rare, and carry with them the note of warning to those still unharmed. These unfortunates have been brought to their condition not so much by over-work as by uninterrupted work. The labors and cares of the day are carried

home to be thought over and worried over during the evening hours, and when, in the stillness of the night, refreshing sleep should bring them recuperation it is driven away by the unrelieved activity of their brains.

Such a life can have but one ending and that not long delayed. In the busy, bustling life of to-day men either do not learn at all, or learn too late, that there is a limit to the enduring power of the brain and nervous system. Like all other parts of the human organism, they have their periods of activity, which must be followed by proportionate periods of rest and recuperation. Rest in this connection does not necessarily mean total cessation of activity, for while inaction does, in a great measure, relieve weariness of the body, it often entirely defeats the purpose of rest for the brain. Control over the latter is sometimes difficult, but it is best accomplished by turning its activity into a new channel, rather than trying to cease its action altogether. How can this be better accomplished than by having some line of study or of occupation, differing totally from that of the day, with which to employ our evening or other spare hours? Thus we may not only rid ourselves of the perplexities and worriments associated with our daily business life, but preserve health, prolong life and add to our happiness and power for good, by the acquisition of knowledge that is ever a power when rightly employed.

Some of the wiser have already learned this lesson and are profiting by it, but with the great majority the lesson still remains unlearned.

Self-culture, when it is undertaken, does not, as a rule, immediately follow graduation. Tired, possibly from his four years' close devotion to books and study, and breathing for the first time the air of perfect mental freedom, the graduate loves for a while to ignore all study and enjoy the rest to which he has long looked forward.

If he have no decided predilection for any particular pursuit, this time is usually spent, or should be, in an analysis of his tastes and capacities and an earnest endeavor to solve that mo-

mentous problem which presents itself to each one, and upon the proper and fortunate solution of which so largely depends his future happiness and success.

The question of vocation settled, he sets about qualifying himself for it, and the few years following are usually so entirely taken up with this preparation that neither time nor inclination remain for the pursuit of any line of study or work other than that upon which he is engaged.

This time passed, and life's work once really begun, he will soon become conscious of the monotony of his daily routine, interesting though it be, and long for a relaxing change. This he may find either in amusements or occupation of a purely diverting character, or in some line of work or employment that shall be both diverting and useful. The former is too frequently chosen when the latter should be. Certainly a diversion can lose none of its charm by having associated with it an element of usefulness, while the gain must be apparent to every one.

Fortunately, we have at command a means of entertainment which, while it affords perfect relaxation, unites with it a most admirable means of real mental culture. We refer to the study of the natural sciences.

Who of us does not remember the pleasure afforded by our first insight to these studies during our college course! how fresh their truths appeared by contrast with some of the dryer metaphysical studies! how easily the facts were acquired and readily retained! and how almost insensibly we were led to a fair comprehension of them by the beautiful and symmetrical order of their arrangement?

Studies of this character, which were fascinating to us then, should prove much more so afterward, with more time in which to prosecute them and more mature minds to bring to their comprehension. If there were no other value in the study of the Natural Sciences than the mere information it brings to us, this would be a sufficient incentive to the study. We cannot afford, in this age, to be ignorant either of the cause of the physical facts occurring under our eye, or of their proper mean-

ing and relation. The world expects of us, and we are not fulfilling our highest duty unless we possess at least a fair acquaintance with the great world of nature which surrounds us. Ignorance upon this subject, even though we be highly educated in the line of our special work, stamps us as incomplete men, men of but partial culture. Do we not constantly meet with persons, accounted cultivated and accomplished, who are unable to intelligently account for some of the ordinary phenomena in the physical world? and are we not mortified and chagrined every day of our lives by seeing the names of those whom we considered wise and intelligent affixed to the testimonials of charlatans and impostors? They have been led astray by their ignorance and have proclaimed the fact to the world in the most public and pernicious manner.

Could any stronger argument be produced in favor of scientific culture?

The study of the sciences, however, is not alone beneficial in the acquirement of information; there is associated with it one of the best means of mental culture or development of the reasoning powers.

Our life may be said to be spent in the search after and the acquirement of truth. Truth, other than revealed, can only be arrived at by observation and reasoning. Observation places us in the possession of a large number of facts; these facts, compared and properly related, lead to the establishment of general principles. In thus passing from particulars to generals, from observed facts to principles, the mind is exercised by the powerful method of inductive reasoning. Again, as in astronomy, we reason from established principles or laws to particular facts and circumstances. Mathematics, as applied to this science, is one of the finest examples of deductive reasoning. The study of the physical sciences affords one of the best methods of both these forms of mental discipline.

Of the physical sciences presenting claims for our attention, physiology, as the science of the laws of the organic or animal

life, and especially of the structure and functions of the human body, must, we think, ever be regarded as the first and most important; for, while the other sciences treat of matter in its various relations to man, physiology has for its subject man himself.

To have life, or at least to enjoy it, man must have health, and he cannot have health in its fullest sense without a knowledge of the organs upon which it is dependent, and their proper treatment and protection. This knowledge the study of physiology affords us. Preceded by or associated with a fair knowledge of the anatomical structure of our body and the wonderful adaptability and correlation of its various members, physiology makes us acquainted with its internal organs and their uses or functions.

It is not enough for us to know that we possess such organs as the heart, the stomach, the lungs or the brain, and that in health they perform their work satisfactorily. We need to know the intricate structure of these and other organs; what service they perform; how they are nourished and how the waste that always accompanies action is repaired. We need to know their relation to one another and how injury to or neglect of one may seriously impair the action of another.

Most persons know that the blood is the life-giving power of the body; that its constant renewal and revivification is in large part effected in the lungs, where it is brought in contact with the oxygen of the air; that it is propelled to the different parts of the body by the heart by way of the arteries and returned to it again through the veins; but what does this knowledge avail us unless we know the constituents of the blood, and how, by proper diet and other agencies, these constituents may be maintained in their proper proportion and relation to be truly efficacious?

So, too, it is commonly known that food taken into the stomach is there prepared for assimilation by a process known as digestion, and that the agent active in this process is the gastric juice; but this knowledge possesses no practical value to us

unless we know how this gastric juice is secreted and thrown out, what an elaborate operation is necessary to its formation, and how over-feeding or too frequent feeding taxes these producing forces and weakens their power, bringing on that most common malady, indigestion.

"*Mens sana in corpore sano*" is an axiom of great antiquity, but how many know that the dependence of the one upon the other is due to the blood—its quality, its quantity and its proper circulation?

But why specify, when the whole process of animal life is so full of hidden wonders and beautiful processes as to make the study of it attractive to fascination? The key to most of these mysteries is in our hands and it needs but little effort to solve them.

The reason why the study of physiology has received so little attention at the hands of the masses is that it has been looked upon as lying rather within the province of the physician. But, while he has more need of it than we, and while it is his duty to penetrate its depths to a greater extent in order to enable him to prevent or treat disease, still, as a science it is the common property of all; and in these days, when sanitation, both public and private, is receiving so large a degree of attention, we cannot afford to be ignorant of at least its leading principles.

But while the importance of understanding the true conditions of health and disease—of knowing how to acquire and preserve that healthy state of body and mind which the most costly and tedious medical treatment so often fails to restore when once lost—may be considered the most practical claim of physiology as a study, it has other equally valuable features.

In it we are first introduced to some of the conceptions which play the greatest part in the moral and social sciences; for it is the first science in which we recognize the influence of habit, the tendency of something to occur because it occurred before; and from it also we get our clearest notions of what is meant by development, or evolution.

The matter of heredity, by which the human race is so greatly affected, either for good or evil, can only be made plain and be properly understood when viewed in the light of physiological law.

Closely and inseparably connected with physiology is psychology, or the philosophy of mind. All mental action has its origin in the brain, and while the construction and physical characteristics of this organ form a part of physiological study, its function or operation comes within the province of psychology.

Mental phenomena are complex and manifold, and without a proper study and understanding of them we utterly fail to comprehend either our own nature or that of our fellow-man. Psychology aims to examine into the nature of the mind, to analyze its characteristics, to arrange them into a convenient order and then to study them both in their individuality and in their relation to one another. The importance of the study can scarcely be over-estimated, for the faculties of the mind in their various manifestations may operate either to the well or ill-being of ourselves or our fellows. With a proper understanding of them we can regulate or direct them to subserve the best interests, whilst without a proper conception of them we may become their slaves instead of their masters.

Men's natural desires, passions and emotions will ever need regulation and guidance, and this can only be properly accomplished by an analysis and comprehension of their true character.

Almost equally as interesting as Physiology is the study of Zoology. So vast is the field which it covers, including all animate existence, from the lowest and least organized form of living matter up to the most intelligent animal, that a complete knowledge of it would be impossible when undertaken solely as a co-ordinate branch of study. Its vastness need not, however, deter us from mastering its leading principles and gaining such knowledge of its beauties as to place us more in harmony and sympathy with its subjects.

Having gone thus far, we may be induced, as others have been, to take up the more careful study of some one of its departments or subdivisions, not only as a relief from other labor, but as a means of adding to our store of knowledge, and thus qualifying ourselves for the entertainment or instruction of others. Indeed, the wonderful progress made in this department of biology has been largely and principally due to the concentration of individual effort upon some single class, and in many cases the life-long investigation has been confined to a single genus or species. Every student of zoology is probably familiar with the world-famous labors of Huber on the Honey-Bee, Lyonnnet on the Goat-Moth and Strauss Durckheim on the Cock-chaffer, and many of us are acquainted with the more recent investigations of the Rev. Dr. McCook into the habits of the ant and spider. The latter were undertaken, not in the interest of science, but as a relief from professional work, and so absorbing did they become that their author was lured as far as Texas in the South and Colorado in the West in his search after more complete knowledge of his favorite insects. Who of us who have read his "Tenants of an Old Farm," and other works, but have blessed him for the entertainment and instruction he has afforded us?

Aside from instruction or entertainment, however, many branches of zoological research have assumed a national importance from an economic standpoint. The *Phylloxera*, which some years ago threatened to destroy the vineyards of France and other countries, was only checked in its destructive work after the patient and laborious investigation of the entomologists had revealed its methods of life and propagation. So, too, the locust and grasshopper of the West, which bid fair at one time to seriously interfere with the material prosperity of our country, were met and overcome by the assiduous efforts of Professor Riley and the entomological corps of the Smithsonian Institution.

Viewed from any standpoint, the pursuit of this study,

in some of its branches, cannot fail to well repay us, for time judiciously spent in the study of nature is never lost.

The science of Botany, constituting as it does the connecting-link between the animal and mineral kingdoms, is one of such rare and universal interest as to have ever had its full share of votaries. This is not to be wondered at when we consider the exactness of its character, the beautiful order of its arrangement and the fact that the materials for its study are generously distributed over the whole habitable portion of the globe.

Its subjects in the main are so attractive to the senses, and contribute so largely to man's pleasure, comfort and well-being, as to place him in sympathy with them from his earliest childhood. It probably is and ever will be the most interesting of the sciences to the masses, and information in regard to it is ever welcomed, though not as assiduously sought after as it might be.

To the biological student it possesses interest on account of its analogy to Zoology and Anthropology, which becomes only truly apparent upon careful study and examination. True, vegetable life has but two principal phenomena, vegetation and reproduction, and these make up the sum and substance of its being, while animal life, in addition to these, has the higher phenomena of sense and will, to which the former are subordinate. In so far as growth and reproduction are concerned, the resemblance between the two kingdoms is very marked, and in the case of the latter, the characteristics in both may be said to be identical. This fact is the more apparent when we consider that both have many organs the same in name and practically the same in character, while in function both have absorption, digestion or assimilation, respiration, circulation of nutrient fluids, evaporation, fecundation and reproduction. The latter phenomenon, in animal life, is brought about either through the egg, or by buds or by division, corresponding very nearly to the triple methods of seed, buds and layering in vegetable life.

But Botany, like Zoology, has proven too large a field for the mass of partial investigators, and many have therefore devoted their time, with greater pleasure and better results, to the study of some single class of the cryptogamous plants, as the fungi, lichens, algæ, mosses or ferns, or some family among the phænogams, as the orchis.

Plants have long been known to be the source, directly or indirectly, of our entire food supply, and thus the promoters of our life and health, and as furnishing also the principal remedies for the cure of disease; but it has only been of recent years that they have been found to be the cause also of our death in many of the most serious maladies to which the human race is subject.

The newly-awakened interest in the subject of Forestry adds another claim to the study of vegetable life in its various bearings.

Geology, as the study of the history of our earth, must ever command the attention and interest of every one who would claim acquaintance with general science. Its mission is to reveal this unwritten history and tell us of the antiquity of our planet, its composition, the order of its formation, the changes in form and temperature which it has undergone to make it habitable, and to discover the various orders of animal and vegetable life that have successively lived and passed away before the advent of man.

Surely, if the history of man and his doings be valuable, so also must that be which tells of the preparation of his habitation. Were it not for the revelations of this science we would be ignorant of the forms of life which have preceded us, for we have no history of them save that written in the rocks by the Creator's hand, and but for the power of science to translate this writing, we could never know of the marvelous changes our earth has undergone since life first appeared upon its surface.

Geology, as with superhuman power, has stretched its hands far out into the depths of the hidden past and dragged forth

from oblivion that which seemed beyond the power of man to recover. It has traced animate life from the *foraminifera* in the Atlantic ooze up to its highest expression in divinely created man, and brought to light the forms of vegetation that have prevailed in ages past. It has taught us the changes wrought by volcano and glacier; how sea and land have often changed places; how continents, one by one, have arisen; how mountain chains have been successively formed; how valleys and ravines have been excavated; and how climates have slowly changed from tropic heat to arctic cold.

To him who has some knowledge of this science, nature wears a new aspect, for he finds in every rock and soil an object of interest with a history which he is able to interpret, while every hill and water-course speak to him in unmistakable language of the changes of the centuries.

In the study of this grand science, the intellect is expanded, thought quickened, reason stimulated, the moral faculties cultivated, and one is led insensibly "from Nature up to Nature's God."

Impressed by the wonderful character of the globe on which we dwell, and the varied extinct forms of life which Paleontology brings to light, the human mind is stimulated to know something of the character of the myriad worlds which surround us, and the forms of life, if any, which there prevail. Thus, the study of Astronomy would naturally follow that of Geology.

From the earliest ages, men of inquiring and contemplative minds have been led by a natural and irresistible instinct to gaze upon the sidereal heavens, to admire their beauty and immensity, to note the constant changes and to speculate upon the nature of the separate orbs and their relation to each other and to us. It is a subject bordering upon infinity, toward which man seems ever attracted. As a study, it has engaged the attention of the best thinkers and most advanced scientists of every age, and the revelations and discoveries that have resulted in recent years from their combined efforts make one

wonder when and where the limit will be set to man's inventive genius and indomitable energy.

We cannot but be impressed with the fact that lenses have been constructed by which the eye has been able to pierce through many millions of miles in space and view a planet or a satellite with such exactness as to carefully define the character of its surface, its mountains and valleys, its land and seas, and plot a map almost as precise as that of our own earth; nor can we fail to admire the ingenuity of man as displayed in the invention of that most wonderful of modern instruments, the spectroscope, by which we are enabled to ascertain the constituent elements of the heavenly bodies and of their enveloping atmospheres.

Further wonder might be manifested, if it were necessary, at that exactness of observation which has resulted in the demonstration of the existence of a star in a given locality long before its actual instrumental discovery.

Certainly, so magnificent a science cannot fail to more and more attract the attention of all who feel an interest in the world's work. That it is receiving more of the attention due it, is shown in the well-equipped expeditions sent out from time to time by the different governments to all parts of the globe to observe and record some interesting astronomical event, and by the more general establishment of observatories in connection with institutions of learning.

A splendid tribute has been paid the science by the recent establishment of a perfectly equipped observatory on the top of the Rocky Mountains, and its permanent and liberal endowment by a man who had scarcely a theoretical knowledge of the science, but who was probably impressed by what he had read of its achievements.

Few of us are privileged to live near observatories, where this study can be most satisfactorily pursued, but the published works of some of the world's best investigators in this line are easily accessible, and from them we may learn the wonderful results that have already been achieved and the still greater ones

that are hoped to be compassed by the devotees of this noble science.

Of Chemistry, as the science of affinities, we have not time to speak, except to call attention to it as one of those sciences whose every act and result is in exact conformity with fixed law. Whether employed to ascertain the constituents of matter, or from single substances to form compounds, its results can be foretold with unerring exactness. On this account, and because it has to deal with all the elements, liquid, solid or gaseous, with which man has to do and upon which he is dependent, it is a science full of interest and worthy of careful study.

We must also refrain, for the same reason, from dwelling upon the vast subject of general Physics. There is, however, one department of Physics, closely related to Chemistry, which we cannot afford to pass over. Although very old, it has become suddenly new by virtue of its recent wonderful development, and is now attracting an amount of attention greater than that bestowed upon any other branch of physical science. We allude to Electricity.

While from the earliest times it has been a subject of interest and investigation, it is less than fifty years since its practical value was first demonstrated through the invention of Morse, and the present decade has witnessed its further adaptability in the transmission of audible speech and the furnishing of light and power on a commercial scale.

Its therapeutic value, also, in the treatment of disease is but just beginning to be properly appreciated, and the careful investigations now being carried on with regard to it bid fair to result in the development of a remedial agent far surpassing in range and potency any that have preceded it.

Yet, with all its recent disclosures, marvelous as they appear, we seem to be but on the threshold of revelation concerning this science, and the human mind can scarcely conceive the possibilities of this wonderful agent in all that relates to the comfort and welfare of man.

The ignorance of the majority in regard to its fundamental principles is as profound as it is deplorable. They know in a general way what has been achieved, and appreciate the importance of all the developments, but they confess themselves ignorant of the properties of the fluid, and of the laws which govern and control it. They seem to look upon the subject as too mysterious to be comprehended by ordinary minds, and content themselves with admiring the achieved results.

In so doing, they not only willfully set a bound to their knowledge, but they unconsciously deprive themselves of the delights of a study than which there is none more wonderful or fascinating.

It becomes us, therefore, as students to have an intelligent understanding of what is now being done toward its development and prepare ourselves for a proper conception of the revelations that are to follow.

In the study of the sciences, our first and main dependence must be placed upon books. Investigation, and, if we please, experiment, will naturally follow, later on; but in the outset we need to become thoroughly acquainted with the subject in hand and to learn what others have observed and done, and this we can only gather from books. In them we find recorded the investigations of those who have preceded us, the labors they have performed, and the results reached. They are our storehouses of knowledge, from which we can draw at will. Vast in number and almost inexhaustible in matter, we find them of such varied character as to suit both the novice and those more advanced.

To books in general, and their value, it were hard to find a more concise and beautiful tribute than that paid them by the great Italian poet Petrarch.

He says: "I have friends whose society is extremely agreeable to me; they are of all ages and of every country. They have distinguished themselves both in the cabinet and in the field, and obtained high honors for their knowledge of the sciences. It is easy to gain access to them, for they are always

at my service, and I admit them to my company and dismiss them from it whenever I please.

"They are never troublesome, but immediately answer every question I ask them. Some relate to me the events of past ages, while others reveal to me the secrets of Nature. Some teach me how to live, and others how to die. Some by their vivacity drive away my cares and exhilarate my spirits, while others give fortitude to my mind and teach me the important lesson how to restrain my desires and to depend wholly upon myself.

"They open to me, in short, the various avenues of all the arts and sciences, and upon their information I may safely rely in all emergencies. In return for all their services, they only ask me to accommodate them with a convenient chamber in some corner of my humble habitation, where they may repose in peace; for these friends are more delighted by the tranquillity of retirement than that with the tumults of society."

We are not required, as in former years, to gain our knowledge of the sciences by the perusal of books strictly didactic in their character, and thus in a measure uninviting; but, as if to lure us to the study of that which we need, we have books offered us in which the subjects are presented in so plain and beautiful a manner as to make the reading of them a positive delight.

Besides the Science Primers, which are calculated to give us exact and moderately complete introduction to the sciences, we have such charmingly written works as those of Gray, Wood, Packard, Proctor, Miss Buckley, John Burroughs, Charles Kingsley, Jean Macé and others, so ingeniously constructed as not only to entertain and instruct children, but adults as well.

In addition to books, we have magazines or periodicals entirely devoted to science, with which to broaden our knowledge; and so great has become the demand for general scientific information that there is scarcely a popular magazine published

in which a scientific article does not appear in each of its numbers.

After having awakened an interest and laid a foundation for knowledge by the study of books, we need to go to Nature herself for further instruction. It is just here that these studies present their hygienic claim in a most positive manner.

Most men, actively engaged in the pursuit of their vocations, need some stimulus to draw them out into the fields and the woods, where alone they can receive the benefit of Nature's therapy. And what is better calculated to take them there than to feel that there is something awaiting them which they greatly desire, and which cannot be obtained without a visit.

If, as we are told, more out-door life is needed to preserve the proper tone of health, what more delightful way could be devised for obtaining it than the study of natural science, which, while it takes us where health may be found, turns aside the channel of our daily thoughts and adds immensely to our store of knowledge?

While we have books on which to ground our study, and observation by which to broaden it, we still need to extend it by minute examination, especially in the departments of Zoology, Botany and Mineralogy.

Our best assistant in this work is the microscope, that wonderful instrument which enables us to penetrate many of the mysteries of Nature and understand the causes of things which without it would probably ever have remained unrevealed.

The unseen world, opened up by its aid, seems as great in extent as that which the telescope strives to explore, and the diminutive achromatic lens of the one has made as wonderful revelations as the gigantic thirty-six inch objective of the other.

Alike in principle, but different in character, these twin marvels of optical science and mechanical skill—one investigating the world beneath us and the other exploring the vast multitude of worlds above and beyond us—have done more

than aught else to reveal to man the wonders of creative power, and awaken within him feelings of the most profound reverence.

Unlike the telescope, whose possession is limited to the few, the microscope is within the reach of all, and when we consider the range of its applicability and the fact that objects for its investigation are to be found everywhere in Nature, unlimited by climate, locality or medium, the wonder is that its possession and use are not more universal.

We have thus hastily and imperfectly sketched the leading features of some of the Natural Sciences, and the incentive to their study, in order to impress upon you their claims for post-graduate consideration.

The field of each one is so great that we cannot expect in our spare hours to gain an extended acquaintance with many of them, but there is no reason why we may not obtain a fair knowledge of at least the leading principles of each, and then, if time and inclination favor, select from among them the one best suited to our tastes and pursue it farther.

Says a recent writer: "At least one science should be acquired by every well-educated person, should be carried into detail, pursued experimentally, and pushed to its boundaries. He should be brought face to face with the stern problems of Nature, and learn to wrestle with the difficulties she offers; only thus can he truly know how much is meant by the word 'truth,' and get the discipline that will give value to his other scientific studies."

Examples of men who have done this are without number, and many of them, to their greater credit be it said, had been without the advantage of the mental training afforded by a college course. Besides ministering to their own pleasure in pursuing their special lines of investigation, they have stimulated others by their example and brought some renown not only to themselves, but also to the community in which they lived. This goodly city of Lancaster will long be proud of the labors of a Rathvon, a Porter and a Stauffer.

The definite knowledge already attained in any branch of the sciences is small as compared with that still to be revealed. In view of this fact, do we not owe it as a duty to do something toward the advancement of that line of study which has for so long a time been our benefactor? Well has it been said, "When nature becomes the subject of study, the love of Nature its stimulus, and the order of Nature its guide, then will results in education rival the achievements of Science in the fields of its noblest triumphs."

VII.

RICHARD ROTHE.

BY CHARLES C. STARBUCK.

II.

A VERY eminent divine, whose name will be easily surmised in the Reformed Church, in talking with me once of theological matters in Germany, remarked of Rothe that he was *geistes stark, aber willensschwach*, and that when Schenkel came forward with his demagogical airs of having a mission to deliver the evangelical consciousness from servitude, Rothe supposed he should be sinning against the Holy Ghost to resist his claim. It is evident from Schenkel's way of talking of him that he regards him as the lawful captive of his sword and of his bow. There is a curious mixture of reverence for his genius and profound piety with superior scorn of his unshaken faith in the strictly supernatural character of Christianity, and in the Bible as the authentic and immovable basis of its right apprehension. Everything in Rothe at variance with church doctrine (of which there is any amount) Schenkel ascribes to the piercing vigor of his understanding. All the rest he pityingly treats as a play of pious fantasy, or a surviving prejudice of youthful devoutness. "Saviour" and "believing" are particularly terms that are the object of his contempt, shown by the quotation marks in which he thinks it necessary to enclose them. And among other doctrines of Rothe, he thinks that his doctrine of sin is one thing in name and another thing in fact. Rothe denies that sin *begins* in the life of the spirit, and therefore Schenkel denies that he has any right to treat it as ever *inhering* in the life of the spirit. But there is not the least inconsistency in this.

Rothe, it is true, treats sin as originating in the preponderance of the sensuous nature. But he allows that the spirit, or more properly the yet unspiritualized personality, out of moral inertia, consents to this preponderance and is capable of finding its pleasure in it, and that in such a measure as to evade and finally to repel all redeeming forces. And he allows it as possible, and in many cases actual, that the soul should become so self-committed to unrighteousness as to organize itself, on the basis of this choice, into a fiend-like counterpart of true spirituality, capable of indefinite duration and of superhuman power, a form of existence in which wickedness has become so implicated with the being that a moral reversal would seem to involve a physical disintegration. This fact of Diabolization rests just as firmly upon his theory of the origin of sin as the fact of true spiritualization. He has therefore a perfect right to say that the Devil is a warning of the possibility, in passing through evil, of *sticking fast in it*.

His doctrine of the Fall, therefore, treats it as a moral necessity, resting upon a physical necessity, the preponderance of the sensuous nature, in all its forms of craving appetency. But he treats it as none the less a Fall, a consent of the rational creature to desist from the effort to realize the ideal to which his rational powers show him that his nature is preconformed. The belief, however, that a finite being can be *created* holy, Rothe absolutely rejects. He says that holiness must be the result of self-determination. God's holiness is an eternal self-determination. He is Himself the cause of His own holiness. And were it possible that He could create a being who was holy by his mere creation, such holiness would not be ethical, but magical. It would not, therefore, be the counterpart of the holiness of God. God, therefore, could not honor it or rest in it. In other words, it would not be holiness at all.

Rothe, therefore, does not acknowledge that the angels could have been created angels. Like all rational creatures, he holds, they must have come from nothing through matter. In other words, they must have been originally rational animals, that is,

in fact, men, though not necessarily men upon this earth. In this it will be seen he agrees with Swedenborg, though neither in the principles nor methods of their philosophy is there the slightest congruity between them. Every angel, therefore, is a redeemed creature, as every fiend is a creature who, on some planet, has gathered together his powers in final impenitency against an offered redemption.

Rothe holds that, apart from the question of the human protoplasts, the origin of the race, as resulting from a disproportionate balance of appetency over reason, necessarily implies in each individual a lack of moral proportion. The Fall, therefore, is a necessity, remaining, however, none the less a Fall. As Scotus Erigena appears to have taught, though on utterly different principles, man is, originally, in Paradise only in idea. In fact he falls out of it at the very beginning of his being.

God, however, does not, on a planet, does not, for instance, on our planet, create for nothing. He means each world which comes to a ripeness for rational life, to be a nursery of a definite organism of angelic beings, of an angelic heaven. But since, through the inevitableness of a Fall in each case, this creative end cannot be accomplished through creation merely, every purpose of creation in the Divine thought implies also a purpose of Redemption. There is here a casual, but merely a casual, resemblance to the questions of Supra- and Sublapsarianism. God does not ordain a Fall in order to a Redemption; nor does He merely, foreseeing a Fall, decree a Redemption to man in order to manifest the glory of His compassion, while withholding it from other beings in order to manifest the glory of his righteousness. He proposes to redeem because, the Fall being inevitable, Redemption is necessarily the second stage of His fundamental purpose, which is to fashion the void into a likeness with Himself, by bringing out of it an ever-growing organism of creatures conformed to Himself, in whom He may dwell. And as these creatures all fall, Redemption is as necessary as Creation, if Creation is not to fail. In truth, Redemption, in this view, is the final stage of Creation.

This position, that if God creates, He will redeem, has nothing in common with the strange and most irreverent declaration of a great American divine, that if God, after the fall of His creation, did not set about recovering it, He would, in view of His transcendent endowments, be a stupendous failure. This blood-curdling manner of speech is in no way alien to the theology of his region, whose ultimate principle is not so much the Living God as an abstract, impersonal somewhat, known as the Good of Being, of which the Living God is merely the servant and organ, being reduced under its sway into a mere place of pre-eminence among His own creatures. There is no approach to any such impiety in Rothe. He knows God only as the Living Source of good and right, beyond and above whom they do not exist. His necessity of redeeming that which has fallen is simply, as Rothe views it, the relation between Creation and Redemption which is involved in the well-known principle that "to ordain an end is to ordain the necessary means."

This Redemption upon earth (which Rothe holds to be typical, in this regard, of every other world), requires a long course of preparatory workings. The human consciousness of God, being depressed by sin far below its normal level, is incapable of restoring itself to this. The revelation of God in nature, outer and inner, is therefore not sufficient. God must intervene, by acts which are not included in the original scheme of Creation. Miracle, therefore, is absolutely essential as an antecedent condition of Redemption. Miracle rouses the sin-fettered and sin-weakened consciousness of God towards its normal height. And He repeats these miracles, in such form, intensity and frequency, as is necessary to withhold the consciousness of Him from fruitlessly lapsing back into its original depression. Therefore it is that He concentrated them principally upon a definitely elected people, that their gathering force might continually more and more raise and purify the consciousness of God in this as in a preparatory centre.

Miracle, however, is not sufficient without Prophecy, whose work it is to set the meaning of Miracle home to the masses,

that might otherwise lose themselves in merely wondering at it. Prophecy implies Inspiration. Prophecy also is miraculous; a true inward miracle, corresponding to the outward miracle. It is a truly and strictly supernatural inworking of God upon specially prepared minds, making them interpreters of Miracle, on its ethical and spiritual side, to their fellow-men at large.

These two factors, in their various degrees and interactions, the Work of power, whereby God strikes in upon the ordinary connection of second causes, and calls attention to Himself: and the Word of power, which saves the Sign from degenerating into a mere Portent—have as their result a growing consciousness of God. This consciousness grows in strength, height and purity. The one purpose of both Miracle and Prophecy is to strengthen and purify it. It is, once developed and rooted, an immediate and experimental consciousness. It is not a deduction from a body of doctrines specifically revealed. There is no such body of doctrines, and cannot be. No secondary truth, greater or less, can have any meaning to the mind or any spiritual force over the soul, except as this is seen for itself as a necessary relation of created things, disclosed in the illumination of God's presence. Neither before nor since Christ, therefore, is there a body of doctrines revealed in the form of statements, a *depositum fidei*. God does not reveal propositions, He reveals Himself.

The result of this continuous advance of religious consciousness within the chosen people (that is, of course, excluding those who, by their own fault, are made worse thereby), is a gradual rectification of religious character, and of ethical disposition. Outside of the chosen people there may be, as indeed we know there was, among the Greeks and Romans, a far wider and richer and more scientific development of general Ethics. But there was no corresponding development of the *religious* consciousness, but on the whole rather a decline. So profound, though in large tracts of thought so curiously perverse an ethical thinker as Plato, could say of his religious speculations, that they were merely a raft of guesses, on which they might

make shift to float, until some word of God should come. The ethical purification of the holy seed among the chosen people is principally, under the power of the consciousness of God, a purification of the individual character, within the elementary ethical relations. A more complex ethical development among the Jews would have hindered rather than helped the Redeemer, whose work of regeneration was to begin, as Rothe says, *at the religious centre of mankind*. Thereby the unincumbered spirit of Christ has been able to take possession of all ethical forms of every age and nation which are approximately just, rectifying, purifying and exalting them, but not cramping them. So far as they have been in fact cramped, it has been through the imperfection of his secondary agents, of which Christendom is slowly working itself free. Therefore, it is that, as John Stuart Mill has said, Christ's words can never be constructed into a practicable system of ethics. Mill has been severely censured for saying this, by those who have overlooked his accompanying declaration, that our Saviour's words have accomplished all that He intended by them; that He means them simply as illustrations of an ethical code which He wished to commend and enforce, but only partially to provide. To this Archbishop Whately adds a very important suggestion, which has been obscured by the long reign of legalism which has been a pædagogic necessity for Christendom, and from which it is unsafe to extricate it too precipitately. Whately remarks that our Lord has cast His moral precepts, of set purpose, into the forms of paradox, so that moral sluggishness and unmanliness, determined to rest inactively upon Him as a Levitical legislator, merely a greater Moses, should always find a very uneasy bed.

According to Rothe, this gradual purification, rectification and exaltation of the religious and moral consciousness and character in unity under the growing consciousness of God, assumes an advancing specialization within the holy seed, until at last there is formed a Holy Family, a focus of divine indwelling, within which the process of rectification is so nearly complete,

that God is at length able, though not without the consummating stroke of Miracle, to bring forth the Redeemer, to bring forth a Soul, which from the beginning of its existence shall be *absolutely—schlechtthin*, to use Rothe's favorite word—exempt from all other impelling power than that of God Himself.

This necessity, intrinsic and absolute, not merely a necessity of seemliness, that there should be a Holy Family, in order to the birth of the Holy One, is the truth which lies at the bottom of the portentously exaggerated Roman Catholic reverence for Mary, and lately for Joseph, which, growing out of a sound root, has, at least in Italy, reached almost the proportions of a Gnostic heresy. That charming man, Cardinal Gibbons, in his delicious little book, *The Faith of our Fathers*—which, in its union of courtesy, cogency, sly wit and abounding charity, ought to be studied as a model of religious controversy, by us, as well as by our brethren of the other side—alleges a favorite Roman Catholic argument for the actual sinlessness of the Virgin, in both its strength and its weakness. He says that the perfect submission of our Saviour's youth to parental control implies an entire absence of wrong commands given Him, which could not have been possible, had Mary not been without sin. The Archbishop, at this point, lets good will carry the argument beyond its proper force. There are two kinds of wrong commands: those which it is wrong to give, but right to obey, and those which it is wrong either to give or obey. Mary, and Joseph as well as Mary, were doubtless so near sinlessness that they were preserved from ever giving commands of the second class to the Divine Child. But the preservation neither of His sinlessness nor of the needed harmony of the Holy Home, requires that they should have been absolutely preserved from giving commands of the former class. This is an argument *ab extra*, used to prop up a previously accepted Mariolatry, like the arguments now in vogue with a once eminent Quarterly, to support the equally baseless, and far more deadening, Bibliolatry, to which, since its transmigration, it has committed itself in a new-born zeal of "lying for God." The doctrine of Mary's actual

sinlessness is bad enough, as everything is bad which is false ; but the addition to it of the Immaculate Conception has really made of her the original Redeemer, and of her Son merely a derivative one. No wonder then, that years ago Jesuits in Rome complacently admitted to Mr. Seymour, that the religion of Italy was every day becoming more and more that of Mary, and less and less that of Christ. We may take some small comfort, however, in the intelligence that Rome has at length peremptorily forbidden the outrageous phrase : " Virgin, command thy Son."

When once sentimentalism and self-will together have taken the bit between their teeth, there is no telling where they will hold up. Many of the arguments for the sinlessness of Mary are so applicable to Joseph likewise, that one could hardly tell beforehand what would be the issue of such a movement as that supposed in *Le Maudû*, apparently on some foundation of fact. St. Joseph appears to one of his ardent votaries, and plaintively sets forth the injustice which he is suffering at the hands of the faithful. " I am far," he says, " from envying the honors of my thrice-chaste and thrice-beloved spouse." *Elle est immaculée ; mais moi, moi, je suis aussi immaculé.*

At the same time, as a Protestant, I must own the force of Dr. Arnold's words, that our Bibliolatry is quite as bad as the Roman Catholic Mariolatry. As Dr. Charles Augustus Briggs has remarked, the adoration of the Bible is quite as bad as the adoration of the sacrament, and, I may add, is in some points worse than the extravagant honors rendered the Virgin, who is not, like the Bible, identified with God by being called *theanthropic*. If the Bible can be called theanthropic, it is no longer the instrument, but the object of faith.

According to Rothe, therefore, an approximation to passive sinlessness must be assumed in the Holy Family, and especially in the Mother of the Redeemer. But it is absolutely necessary, necessary in the very nature of things, that His origin should be miraculous. Grant that such a fact is incapable of being established historically : it is established in the very fact that

He is the Sinless Redeemer. This doctrine, therefore, is with Rothe no mere tradition, no mere embellishment of piety or "scaffolding of faith:" it is involved in his whole system. Only on this condition would it be possible to bring forth that Soul in which, from the beginning, God could *absolutely* dwell.

And here permit me to remark upon what seems to me, in this respect, a very strange attack made by one of our greatest naturalists upon Mr. Joseph Cook, who had said that the miraculous birth of our Lord was certainly not rendered less credible by the now well-ascertained fact that there is in nature a basis of physical possibility, of which the wonder-working providence of God could avail itself at this redemptive epoch of the *magnus ordo saeculorum*. One would have supposed that such an easy conciliation of the natural and supernatural, founded on undisputed fact, would have been most welcome to a believing naturalist. But no, he falls into a genuine intellectual rage over the suggestion, and declares that unless it is to us the absolute and supreme Miracle, it is nothing. That is, it is nothing if it conforms to the essential possibilities and predispositions of nature, but glorious if it thwarts them! Verily, the ways of believing naturalists, as well as of other classes and masses of men, are sometimes hard to find out. It is not prodigiousness which is here required, but simply an intrinsically necessary antecedent condition to that which is indeed the Absolutum Miraculum, namely, the appearance, in a true and perfect humanity of Soul and Body, of Him who is at the same time the Second Adam, the Lord from heaven.

Rothe believes that the Christology of the Church will never reach its true completion until she frankly recognizes that of which she has always been so shy, that as the Saviour's humanity unfolded, He more and more appropriated the indwelling of God by an unbroken series of ethical acts. And indeed what else did the church decide, when she rejected the Monothelite heresy? Rothe fully allows that the rejection of a *merely* moral union between Godhead and Manhood in Christ is thoroughly well-grounded: but remarks that a moral union is always, in.

proportion to its degree of advancement, a real union, and that a consummate moral union is an absolutely and irrevocably substantial union. I do not know whether Dr. Newman Smyth has given very particular attention to Rothe, but he mentions as a pregnant truth brought out by modern German theologians that in everything ethical there is something ontological. This seems to be the other side of a late proposition of physical science: "Knowledge is incipient life."

Rothe, therefore, does not concede to our Lord the name of God at the beginning, in the same absolute sense in which he does at the end, after the Passion and the Resurrection, when His glorified humanity had become, in soul and body, absolutely pervious and flexible to the Godhead. In the "days of his flesh" He was, as the Epistle to the Hebrews puts it, not yet "consummate"—*τετελειωμένος*. Absolute sinlessness is involved in the very fact of His being the Redeemer. But there is a distinction between Sinlessness and Consummation, which warranted Him, while on earth, in rejecting the epithet Good, as applied to Himself, since there was yet in Him that which was in a manner opaque to the Godhead, not as being in any wise sinful, but as being involved in the very idea of humanity that has not yet reached its goal of development. But since His glorification, His humanity, retaining its boundaries and essential properties, is, without any restriction of meaning, "assumed into the Godhead."

It is quite unnecessary to ask whether Rothe holds that Christ, on earth and in heaven, and to all eternity, is a limited being. The answer to this is implied in the statement that he believes in the Incarnation, and that a real Incarnation, not a merely Docetic one. If God has come to dwell plenarily, perfectly, eternally, in a human soul and body, it is plain that all His acts through that soul and body must be limited by its limitations, whether acts of knowledge or acts of will. He cannot exercise an infinite act through a finite medium, without exploding it into nothingness. The current doctrine of the Kenosis evidently appears to Rothe absolutely senseless. He cannot conceive

what is meant by teaching that God, in Himself, is capable of demitting His absolute knowledge and power. He might as well be conceived as capable of demitting His very being. But God, communicating Himself in knowledge through humanity can only know finitely; in power, can only will finitely. Rothe does not hold any form of that Monophysitism, or more truly Docetism, into which so much of our current orthodoxy has lapsed, and which it holds with a persecuting stupidity ludicrously unconscious of itself, but holds that God in Christ has a true humanity, and that therefore in Christ He is the Absolute One, self-limited, for the limited, though gloriously ample work of redeeming elect humanity. But God in Christ does not express Himself incidentally, but centrally and personally. And God in Christ is in uninterrupted communication with the plenitude of Godhead, commanding and drawing upon all its treasures, both of knowledge and power, just as far and fast as the necessities of His work required, so that his activity in each stage of His guidance of His church is at once limitedly human and unlimitedly divine.

According to Rothe, however, God does not only become Man but becomes Mankind. The sense of this most pantheistically sounding proposition, in a writer who says of himself, and everywhere makes good his saying, that since his fifteenth year he "has not discovered a pantheistic or anti-supernaturalistic capillary in himself," deserves a fuller explication than I can give it at the end of this paper.

Andover, Mass.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

ENCYCLOPÆDIA OF LIVING DIVINES and Christian Workers of all Denominations in Europe and America. Being a Supplement to the Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge. Edited by Rev. Philip Schaff, D.D., LL.D., and Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson, M.A. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Astor Place, 1887. Price, in cloth, \$3.00.

This volume is intended to be a supplement to the "Schaff-Herzog Encyclopædia of Religious Knowledge," but, at the same time, it is also a complete work in itself. It is made up of biographical sketches of contemporary divines, celebrated preachers, Christian workers, theological professors, church dignitaries and editors of prominent religious periodicals. In these sketches, facts, as to time and place of birth, education, titles, denominational connections, offices, and publications are invariably given. Great care, moreover, has been taken to make the information conveyed perfectly accurate; and to attain this end proof was sent for revision to each living person named, that the necessary corrections might be made. In cases where divines choose to indicate their theological stand-point in a distinctive way, it is given in their own words, and when not thus given it is left to be inferred from their reputation and works. The book accordingly presents, in a condensed form, just such information as every student finds it very desirable to have, but which, heretofore, it was very difficult to obtain. We can heartily commend the work to our readers as a very interesting and serviceable one. It has received the highest commendations from distinguished scholars, both in Europe and America. For our part, we find it an almost indispensable book of reference. The hearty thanks of all students are due to the editors and the publishers for placing such an admirable Encyclopædia within their reach. No one who purchases it will be likely to regret having done so.

THE BIBLE WORK: THE OLD TESTAMENT, Vol. I. Genesis, Chap. I, to Exodus, Chap. XII. From the Creation to the Exodus. The Revised Text, arranged in sections; with Comments selected from the choicest, most illuminating and helpful thought of the Christian centuries. Taken from four hundred scholarly writers. Prepared by J. Glenworth Butler, D.D. New York: Funk and Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Astor Place, 1887. Price, \$4.00 per volume.

In the preparation of this volume, Dr. Butler has applied the same method which characterizes his two volumes on the New Testament, which were published several years ago. The present volume, however, we consider, in many respects, superior to those which have preceded it. In a personal word to the reader the author states that "the aim has been to furnish, in a single compendium, an orderly, coherent, proportionate and measurably complete exposition of the Sacred Text, so that the meaning of the Divine utterances, as discerned by studious, devout interpreters, qualified by special gifts or attainments, may be disclosed to all who will devoutly read." In accomplishing his purpose, he has admirably succeeded. The comments with which, in the volume before us, the reader is presented, have been selected with great care and judiciousness from the writings of the best Christian scholars and orators, and give just such information as is most desirable and necessary for a right understanding of God's Word. Moreover, as all critical processes are omitted, the work is especially suited to supply the wants of the ordinary reader. For general use indeed we know of no commentary on the Pentateuch which will be found so serviceable as this. To both ministers and laymen it will prove a very valuable help in the study of the Sacred Scriptures. The second volume which will complete the commentary on the Pentateuch is promised by the publishers in October next. We shall eagerly await its appearance.

THE NEW PSYCHIC STUDIES IN THEIR RELATION TO CHRISTIAN THOUGHT.
By Franklin Johnson, D.D. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Astor Place. 1887. Price, 75 cents.

The so-called New Psychic Studies pertain not to the ordinary operations of the mind, but to the unusual, such as thought-transference, somnambulism, mesmerism, clairvoyance, spiritualism, apparitions of the living, haunted houses, ghosts and the Buddhistic

occultism. They deal therefore with subjects that have ever called forth a deep interest because of their mysterious and apparently supernatural character. These studies have been carried on chiefly under the direction of the British Society for Psychical Research, which was constituted in 1882 under the presidency of Professor Henry Sidgwick, of Trinity College, Cambridge, and which in April, 1885, numbered already five hundred and eighty-six members, many of whom are men of the highest standing in all departments of knowledge. In the small volume before us an account is given of the investigations that have been made and of the conclusions which in some cases have been reached. The book, accordingly, as may readily be imagined, contains much very interesting information, a knowledge of which can scarcely fail to be of service to ministers and others to whom it is intrusted the work of public instruction. Though these studies have but been scientifically entered upon, and much necessarily yet remains to be done before satisfactory conclusions in regard to many matters pertaining to them can be reached, yet nevertheless certain things seem already to be well established. The author of the treatise under consideration holds, for instance, that we may place mind-reading among the assured facts of science, though, in its clearer forms, it is seldom met with, and that the existence of mesmerism cannot be disputed, and henceforth only its nature, its limitations and its practical uses will be debated by its students. He also holds that it must be admitted that persons who are in danger or are about to die sometimes transmit to their friends and relatives, though separated from them by great distances, their apparitions and their voices. Christians, he thinks, have no reason to regret the work already done by the Psychical Society, or to fear that which is to follow, but, on the contrary, may hope to learn much that shall tend to confute infidelity, to break the bonds of superstition, to check vice and crime and to illustrate the teachings of their religion. On all these points we are disposed to agree with him, and we feel assured, moreover, that no one can read the account which he gives of the New Psychic Studies without being entertained and instructed thereby.

PULPIT TREES AND HOMILETIC UNDERGROWTH; Being Discourses, Sermonic Saplings, Outlines, and Germs, by Rev. Thomas Kelly, Philadelphia. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Astor Place, 1887. Price, \$1.50.

The Pulpit Trees of this volume, as indicated in the title-page, are sermons, and the Homiletic Undergrowth consists of outlines of sermons. Of the former there are nineteen and of the latter twenty-five.

The sermons are of a plain, practical character and will repay

perusal. Among the subjects discussed in them are: Spiritual Telegraphy, Shamgar, The Borrowed Axe, Character of Zaccheus, The Guiding Word, Power of Conscience, Ministerial Solicitude, Peter's Fall: Its Lessons, and Its Philosophy, The Wonderful Name, and Jesus Knocking. The outlines are suggestive and may be studied with profit. The book as a whole, however, is not one of very great merit.

HINTS ON EARLY EDUCATION AND NURSERY DISCIPLINE. New York: Funk & Wagnalls, Publishers, 18 and 20 Astor Place, 1887. Price, 60 cents.

This little volume which is a duodecimo of 97 pages is a reprint of a work originally published in London some sixty years ago and which has passed through quite a number of editions. Its authorship has been attributed to a sister of Elizabeth Fry, the distinguished philanthropist, but it was never acknowledged by her, at least publicly, and it is not certainly known, therefore, who wrote it. No one, however, can carefully read it, we think, without being convinced that the author was unquestionably a person possessed of much practical wisdom. The instruction given in its pages is in every respect most admirable and there can be no doubt that great good would result to the rising generation if parents and others having to do with the training of children could all be induced to pursue the course suggested in these hints. Piety and good morals at least would be greatly advanced. We heartily commend the book to all who are concerned in the education of the young. Its contents are truly valuable and Messrs. Funk & Wagnalls have done well in giving it anew to the public.

THOUGHTS OF BEAUTY AND WORDS OF WISDOM. From the writings of John Ruskin. Edited with an introduction by Rose Porter, Boston: D. Lothrop Company, Franklin and Hawley Streets, 1887. Price 1.00.

This volume is made up of Thoughts of Beauty and Words of Wisdom, selected from Ruskin's discourses on nature, morals and religion. It is consequently a brilliant collection of thought-jewels and word-paintings. In its contents we have presented to us glorious revelations of the wonders of earth and sky, of mosses and flowers, of birds and clouds, of life and love of truth and beauty, of knowledge and religion, and of a variety of other subjects related to these. No one, we think, can read the volume without being impressed with the brilliancy of its thoughts, and inspired by them with a strong desire for the good, the beautiful and the true. The book, moreover, is of such a character that it can be taken up at spare moments with great benefit. It is not necessary to read it continuously to be profited by it. Every paragraph is complete in itself and is a rich mine of valuable and suggestive instruction. Those who are not acquainted with Ruskin's writings will find it an

admirable introduction to them, and those who have read them will find it a very convenient thesaurus of his best and most beautiful thoughts.

THE LIFE OF JESUS, According to Extra Canonical Sources. By Rev. Bernhard Pick, Ph. D., New York: John B. Alden, publisher. 1887. Price 50 cents.

This "Life of Jesus" is mainly drawn from the Apocryphal Gospels of the New Testament of which quite a number have come down to us from the first Christian centuries. Though these gospels have attracted no little attention and we have several translations of them into English, yet this is the first attempt to present to English readers a biography of Jesus compiled from them and a few kindred documents alone. The work therefore supplies a real want. In preparing it, Dr. Pick has followed the plan and arrangement of a similar work in Germany by Rudolph Hofmann, entitled *Das Leben Jesu nach den Apokryphen*, and published at Leipzig in 1851.

The work itself is valuable on various accounts. Besides being a literary curiosity it gives an insight into the views entertained of the person and life of Jesus by many in the early Christian ages, and shows us what kind of a Saviour men are disposed to invent. A comparison of the life of Jesus, as portrayed in this little volume with that presented in the Canonical gospels can scarcely fail therefore to be instructive. It will furnish any but the most skeptical readers, we think, with strong proof of the genuineness and authenticity of the received gospels as well as of their inspired character. Moreover, this life of Jesus explains many works of Christian art which embody the legends contained in it, and throws light on not a few of the dogmas and usages of the Church of the Middle Ages, which date back to these same legends and in a measure owe to them their existence. Ministers and all others who are interested in theological studies will find this work a desirable addition to their library. Its cheapness places it within the reach of all.

LIFE AND TIMES OF HENRY MELCHIOR MÜHLENBERG. By William J. Mann, D.D., Pastor Emeritus of St. Michael and Zion congregation, and Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Evangelical Lutheran Church at Philadelphia. Philadelphia, G. W. Frederick, 117 N. Sixth Street. 1887.

We have here a substantial volume of 547 pages, gotten up in the best style, and presenting an appearance that comports well with the able character of its contents. No better subject in the history of the Lutheran Church in this country could present itself for an interesting biography than the life of Henry Melchior Mühlberg. As its title indicates, it is, indeed, something more than a biography—it is at the same time a historical sketch of the times in which

Mühlenberg lived, especially in reference to the church in Germany and America.

It is just one hundred years since Mühlenberg died. He was born on the 6th of September, 1711, at Eimbeck, Germany, and closed his earthly life at his residence near Philadelphia October 7, 1787, at the age of seventy-six years and thirty-one days.

It would carry us beyond the limits assigned for this notice to refer at length to the events in the life of Mühlenberg, his preparations for his life-work at the Universities of Göttingen and Halle, and his career in America as the leading founder of the Lutheran Church in this new world. He was for that church what Rev. Michael Schlatter was for the German Reformed Church. We have a good biography of Schlatter by Dr. Harbaugh. We could only wish that it were clothed in so goodly a dress as this life of Mühlenberg by Dr. Mann, and we think the forth-coming memoir of Dr. Nevin might see something in this volume worthy of imitation in this respect.

It will ever stand as a testimony to the strength of character in Mühlenberg that, though he imbibed all the better elements of the pietism of Spener, at Halle, yet he was free from its weaknesses, and in laying the foundations of the Lutheran Church in this country, he remained true to the original principles and the conservative spirit of the Lutheran Church of the great reformation. This work deserves a wide circulation, not only in the Lutheran Church, but in other Protestant Churches as well.

THE EVANGELICAL PASTOR. By Rev. Edward T. Horn, A.M., pastor of St. John's, Charleston, S. C. Philadelphia, G. W. Frederick, 1887.

While it is a matter of no concern to the reader of these lines, yet the reminiscence will be pardoned which carries us back to a period in our early married life in Easton, Pa., when the author of this book was a bright little boy, the joy of fond parents with whom we enjoyed relations of friendly association in our own boyhood days. The author is now a successful pastor and preacher in the Lutheran Church, and a close student as well as an interesting writer. The work he here presents is a contribution to Pastoral Theology. It is based on the *Amerikanisch-Lutherische Pastoraltheologie* of the now lamented Rev. Dr. C. F. W. Walther, of St. Louis, Mo. Following an elaborate preface the author presents his subject in the form of question and answer, including the following topics: The Pastor's Conversation, The Call, Beginning of the Pastorate, The Pastor Preaching, Holy Baptism, Preparation for the Holy Sacrament, The Holy Supper, Marriage, Confirmation and Catechization, Seelsorge, House Visitation, Visitation of the Sick, The Dying and the Dead, Discipline, Sunday Schools, Collections, etc. In the Community and at Home, The End of the Pastorate. On all these sub-

jects young pastors need instruction, and though this little book is written from a Lutheran standpoint, yet it is free from narrowness. Some things in the section on the Holy Supper give a more liberal representation of that sacrament than some might expect to find. For instance: 133. "Do the elements undergo a change in consequence of the repetition of these words" (the consecration)?

"*Nihil habet rationem Sacramenti extra usum divinitus institutum.* The Sacramental union takes place in the administration, when the blessed elements are given and received. Therefore the elements, after they have been blessed, may not be adored, and though they have been separated to a holy use, apart from that use neither are, nor contain the Body and Blood of the Lord."

This is certainly not *impanation* nor does it sound like consubstantiation

The book contains many valuable hints for pastoral work.

EVOLUTION AS TAUGHT IN THE BIBLE. By Rev. G. C. H. Hasskarl. Price, 25 cents. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa.

RAYS OF LIGHT ON THE SOCIAL PROBLEM. By A. E. Schade, 1886. German Publishing House, 991 Scranton Avenue, Cleveland, O.

This little tract of a little over thirty pages was not sent to us to notice, but was circulated at the General Synod at Akron, O., and so a copy came into our hands, and we brought it with us home and we have read it with great interest. The writer shows himself fully acquainted with his subject. Barring some Germanisms in the style it is quite equal to more pretentious essays that claim public attention on one of the burning problems of the day.

The author, Rev. A. E. Schade, is pastor of a Reformed Church in Cleveland, O., and has had opportunity to study the spirit of spurious socialism as it manifests itself in our larger American Cities, especially in the West.

He very truly maintains that the spirit of Christ alone, as bringing to pass a new brotherhood among men, can save the world from its social evils. But he maintains also that the church, as a social institution, should take steps to meet the evil and dangerous associations of the day by others of a Christian character. In the conclusion of his tract he presents "outlines of a proposed constitution for a new Labor Organization," under the title "GUILD-HALL ASSOCIATION," based upon Christ's *Golden Rule*. We know of some congregations in which such *guilds* have been organized, to take the place of the numerous worldly societies into which Christians enter if they have nothing of this kind to meet what has come to be a felt want in our Christian social economy. Whether the plan is capable of such wide expansion as the constitution in this tract contemplates, or not, may be a question. The subject is certainly worthy of earnest consideration, and this tract casts some rays of light upon it.